NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXIX.

DECEMBER, 1895.

THE WORK OF THE NEXT CONGRESS.

BY MAYO W. HAZELTINE: AND REPRESENTATIVES THOMAS C. CATCHINGS, OF MISSISSIPPI; JONATHAN P. DOLLIVER, OF IOWA; GEORGE N. SOUTHWICK, OF NEW YORK; AND JOHN C. BELL, OF COLORADO.

I.

On the meeting of the new Congress it will be the duty of the President of the United States to make known what steps he has taken to comply with the resolution passed by the last Congress desiring him to urge upon the British Government a reference of the boundary controversy between British Guiana and Venezuela to arbitration. Should it appear that the suggestion, though promptly and earnestly made, has been rejected, and that, either by distinct avowal or by implication the United Kingdom has signified a purpose to occupy by force an extensive tract of land alleged by the republic of Venezuela to constitute a vital section of her territory, it will devolve on Congress to consider whether the Monroe Doctrine is defied by the course of Great Britain, and whether under all the circumstances the United States should enforce that doctrine by deed as well as word.

There are, clearly, several questions which ought to be separately looked at. First, do the arguments for the view of the Caracas government regarding the right line of demarcation between British Guiana and Venezuela present a *primâ facie* case

Copyright, 1895, by Lloyd Bryce. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so strong that in the judgment of onlookers the frontier ought to be defined, not by the arbitrary act of one of the parties to the controversy, but by an impartial international tribunal? Assuming that the reply to this preliminary inquiry is in the affirmative, shall we hold that by repelling arbitration in this matter, and by forcibly detaining a part of Venezuela's territory, England would ignore and set at naught the Monroe Doctrine? If to this question also the answer should be "Yes," we shall have to make up our mind, whether upon the whole, it is expedient to renounce the principles put forth by President Monroe, or whether the actual and prospective consequences of acquiescing in Venezuela's dismemberment are so serious that the firm upholding of those principles should not be left to diplomacy alone, but must, in the last resort, be secured by other means. Of merely secondary and negligible interest are the Yuruan incident and the ultimatum relating thereto, said to have been sent by Lord Salisbury to Caracas; for here the merits of the boundary controversy are manifestly involved, and if Venezuela's territorial claim is well-founded, she has done nothing for which reparation can be demanded.

I.

As regards the boundary controversy we scarcely need to say that Venezuela and Great Britain are respectively the representatives of Spain and Holland. The Caracas government claims all the land possessed by Spain east of the Orinoco in 1810, the date of the assertion of Venezuelan independence. The British Foreign Office claims all the land in that quarter which belonged to Holland in 1814, when "the settlements of Demerara, Berbice, and Essequibo" were ceded by the Dutch to England. The texts of the treaties and diplomatic agreements or admissions, from which the several rights of Spain and Holland may be ascertained, are accessible to every student of international relations. The first document in the case is the Treaty of Münster, by which in 1648 Spain and the United Provinces undertook to define their respective possessions on the north coast of South America. Some misunderstanding having arisen, the treaty between Spain and Holland, which was signed in 1691, stipulated that the Orinoco colonies should belong to the Spanish, and the Essequibo colonies to the Dutch. From the outset of her independent existence Venezuela has insisted, as she still insists, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the "Essequibo colonies" was meant the Dutch settlements on the Essequibo River, and that the boundary intended by the treaty of 1691 was the east bank of that waterway. The counter position originally taken by the British was that what was contemplated by the treaty just named was not the Essequibo River itself, but the entire watershed draining into it. Were the latter interpretation of the text sustained by arbitrators, Great Britain's possessions would receive a considerable extension westward, but the Essequibo watershed could not possibly stretch beyond the Maroco River, which also flows northward and into the Atlantic ocean, fifty miles to the west of the Essequibo. We should note further that, should an impartial tribunal declare that the term "Essequibo colonies" means the Essequibo watershed, a like interpretation would be applicable to another crucial phrase in the treaty of 1691, and by "Orinoco colonies" we should have to understand the Orinoco watershed. In that event England would be obviously constrained to abandon her present claim to Point Barima, which adjoins one mouth of the Orinoco, lying in fact between that river and one of its eastern affluents. From this preliminary stage the course of the boundary dispute has been outlined by the Hon. William L. Scruggs, formerly United States Minister to Caracas. He has shown that the so-called Schomburgk line, drawn in 1841, has no binding force on any one, because, first, the line was drawn without authority, concurrence or even knowledge on the part of Venezuela, and, secondly, eighteen months after the line had been run, Lord Aberdeen, then British Premier, distinctly disclaimed it, and ordered it obliterated by the Demerara colonial authorities. In addition to this disavowal of the Schomburgk line, Lord Aberdeen repeatedly assured the Venezuelan Minister in London that Great Britain had no thought of claiming or attempting to occupy Point Barima or any of the estuaries of the Orinoco, or even any portion of the coast west of the Maroco River. Amazing, indeed, is the difference between the position of Lord Aberdeen, who proposed a boundary line beginning at the mouth of the Maroco River, and the attitude now taken by the British Government which claims west of the Maroco a territory larger than England, and refuses to submit to arbitration any part thereof lying east of the obliterated Schomburgk line, which gives her Point

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Barima at the mouth of the Orinoco and access to the gold fields of the interior.

But, it may be said, the title to domain may rest on other than documentary grounds. There is such a thing as rights gained by prescription. Is it not possible that in the region under dispute, which once at all events was a "No man's land," citizens of British Guiana may have acquired title through long occupation conjoined with an absence of protest on the part of Venezuela? There is no doubt that British colonists have gradually made settlements in parts of the debatable tract, but the other condition requisite for the acquisition of a prescriptive right has been wanting. Venezuela has never waived her claim to any part of the territory, which, as she holds, can be proved by documentary evidence to have been inherited by her from Spain. No such waiver could be legally made, for the Venezuelan constitution debars her government from alienating any portion of the national domain. Venezuela has always contended that the western boundary of the Dutch settlement of Essequibo, acquired by England in 1814, was the east bank of the Essequibo River. Not only has she never acquiesced in any encroachments of British subjects on the land west of that waterway, but she has incessantly protested against such encroachments. While the position of Venezuela, however, has been consistent and unwavering, that of England has been shifted, as earth hunger and reported discoveries of gold have impelled her Guiana subjects to push their frontier westward.

II.

In view of the facts recited, which are believed to be incontrovertible, it seems plain that Venezuela has a strong *primâ facie* case preëminently suited for arbitration, since it cannot be pretended in this instance that the outcome of an impartial interpretation of treaties and other diplomatic documents should be deemed neutralized by the upgrowth of prescriptive rights. We do not hesitate to say that the *primâ facie* case is stronger and more suitable for arbitration than was that of the United States in our controversy with England regarding the boundary of Oregon. Here we may point out that the British Foreign Office cannot consistently aver, as Sir Edward Grey averred not long ago, that "England cannot submit to arbitration her claim to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any territory which has been long occupied by British subjects." England can do this, because she has done it. We have the authority of George Bancroft for asserting that England no fewer than six times offered to submit to arbitration the question of the northwest boundary of the United States, although British subjects had long occupied part of the territory south of the Fifty-four Forty line claimed by our State Department. With this precedent before us, shall we be told that England has outgrown her liking for arbitration? How, then, are we to account for the presentation to the last Congress of a memorial signed by 354 members of the last Parliament, urging that an agreement should be made whereby all controversies between Great Britain and the United States should be referred to arbitrators? Is it strange that some persons should explain a glaring inconsistency on the theory that England's refusal to submit the Venezuela boundary dispute to arbitration is based, first, upon the consciousness of being in the wrong, and secondly, upon the knowledge that Venezuela is a weak power, which, it is assumed, can be plundered with impunity?

III.

Can Venezuela be plundered with impunity? Or is it rather the duty of the United States to interpose, and insist that the disputed boundary shall be defined by an impartial tribunal? Is that duty imposed on us by a logical deduction from the Monroe Doctrine? Taking the latter question first, let us recall for a moment what that doctrine is, as it was expressed by its propounder. The message sent to Congress by President Monroe on December 2, 1823, contained the following words: "We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the allied powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." It is true that with the development of the United States into a power of the first magnitude and with the diffusion of parliamentary government on the other side of the Atlantic, the apprehension of danger to our free institutions from the contiguity of monarchical systems has in large measure disappeared. But that, outside of any terrors on their own account, the people of the United States conceive that they have special rights and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

special duties in the two Americas, rights and duties which might be obstructed by the extension of European dominions within our sphere of influence, is explicitly declared in the ensuing words of the message of President Monroe: "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere; but with the governments which have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and just principles acknowledged, *we could not view an interposition for oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.*" It is the words which we have underscored that render unmistakable the application of the Monroe Doctrine to the Venezuela boundary dispute. Scarcely will any one, we fancy, argue that the forcible dismemberment of an American republic's territory is distinguishable from an attempt to subvert its liberties or to control its destiny. To an attempt to draw such a distinction Venezuela could reply that "You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live;" and that, should England assume a commanding position at the mouth of the Orinoco, she would in the strictest sense control the destiny of the Venezuelan commonwealth; she would, in truth, have set her hand upon its throat. Much the same thing may be said of England's apparent determination to take possession of the remarkably extensive and rich auriferous deposits on the banks of the Yuruan River in the Venezuelan Territory of Uruary. The tremendous significance of the double wrong inflicted may be measured in a sentence. It is as if Great Britain during our civil war, making a vantage ground of proximity and believing us incapable of self-defence, had undertaken to rob us, on the one hand, of California, and, on the other, of the control of the Mississippi.

It seems, then, a logical deduction from the words of President Monroe, that we ought to defend Venezuela from arbitrary dismemberment by insisting on a reference of the boundary question to arbitration. Before inquiring, however, whether what is logical is also expedient, let us glance at two curious statements about the Monroe Doctrine which are occasionally heard from English writers and speakers on the subject. We are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

told, in the first place, that the doctrine can have no application to England, because England was an established American power at the time it was promulgated. The argument evidently proves too much. Russia, France and Spain were all established American powers when the memorable message of President Monroe was written; yet these were the very powers most deeply interested in the reactionary projects of the Holy Alliance, against which the message was directed. *Reductio ad absurdum.* We are also now and then requested, with an air of irony, to name the authority on which the Monroe Doctrine has become incorporated in the law of nations. We have never met an American who imagined the doctrine to be a part of international law. The Monroe Doctrine, as Senator Lodge has pointed out in this REVIEW, is not a law but a fact. It is a deliberate and outspoken declaration of the principal American republic's policy or programme with reference to political conditions on the American Continent. It is a declaration which we have every jot as good a right to make as England has to announce her policy or programme touching the maintenance of her commercial preponderance in the Far East, or of her naval ascendancy in the Mediterranean, or regarding the partition of Africa, or concerning the Ottoman Empire. The Monroe Doctrine not being a law, Englishmen are under no legal obligation to obey it; but from the view-point of expediency and wisdom it may behoove them to consider whether they will treat the doctrine with contempt, just as it behooved Russia in 1878 to decide whether she would spurn England's Eastern programme and face the consequences, or would submit the treaty of San Stefano to a European Congress.

IV.

There remains only the inquiry whether in the situation presented by the Venezuela controversy it is worth our while to adhere stiffly to the Monroe Doctrine even at the risk of war, should Great Britain persist in withholding the boundary dispute from arbitration, or whether we should do better to abjure the doctrine altogether. One thing or the other we must make up our minds to do; and the precedent now to be established will be big with safety or with peril to many weak commonwealths in the New World. Let us mark not merely the actual and immediate but the ultimate consequences of our renouncing the principles formulated by Monroe, and of our leaving the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Caracas government at the mercy of British aggression. The first point to be noted is that there are five great river systems in the habitable part of the American Continent, namely, those of the St. Lawrence, of the Mississippi, of the Amazon, of La Plata, and of the Orinoco. Of these England already possesses one, that of the St. Lawrence; unless we now interpose to shield Venezuela from violent encroachment, a second, that of the Orinoco, will inevitably fall under British sway, and a great monarchical power may be built up in the southern half of this hemisphere, a counterpart of that already erected in British North America. We call the Dominion of Canada a monarchy, and unquestionably the term may be applied to it, as properly as to the United Kingdom. Only the name is lacking, and even that was forthcoming in the original draught of the British North America Act. We know on the authority of the chief author of that measure, Sir John Macdonald, that he proposed to call the new confederation a "kingdom," and to bestow upon the English sovereign the title of "Queen of Canada."

Even more wide and ominous than its bearing on the fate of the Orinoco basin is the scope of the question raised by the controversy touching the Venezuela boundary. A glance at the map will show that the same game of successive encroachments which is being played to-day at the cost of Venezuela may be practised to-morrow to the detriment of Brazil. On the south British Guiana is bounded with convenient vagueness by the Brazilian Republic, and the east fork of the Parima River, one of the most important northern members of the Amazon River system, takes its rise in British territory. If, under color of frontier disputes, which she refuses to refer to arbitrators, England is now allowed to deprive Venezuela of the Orinoco basin, what is to prevent her from depriving Brazil hereafter of the vast valley of the Amazon? Then, again, why should not a precedent, once established for South America, be followed in Central America as well? If, proceeding from Guiana as a basis, England is suffered to absorb a large part of Venezuela, why should she not, starting from the territory of Belize, manage gradually to swallow Honduras, Guatemala, and Yucatan?

V.

We add that, were it conceivable that the next Congress could repudiate the Monroe Doctrine and refuse to back Venezuela in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her boundary dispute, there is still one expedient to which in its extremity the Caracas government might have recourse. It would have but to follow the course actually taken by the republic of Texas, and subsequently proposed by Yucatan, the course, namely, of applying for admission to the American Union. The position of Venezuela, indeed, at this juncture is in many respects analogous to that which Texas occupied in 1845. The latter commonwealth, which then had been independent for eight years, was confronted by the harsh alternative of suffering the loss of its great river, the Rio Grande, and of much valuable territory, or of engaging, single-handed, in a hopeless war with the vastly preponderant power of Mexico. It shrewdly avoided impalement on either horn of the dilemma by becoming one of the United States. Venezuela has no present advantages to lose, and immense future advantages to gain, by following the Texan precedent. Within twenty-four hours after her admission to the Union she would witness a striking and gratifying change in the attitude of the British Foreign Office, which would show itself as eager to invoke a decision by impartial umpires concerning the Guiana frontier, as it did in the matter of the Oregon boundary controversy, when, as George Bancroft noted, it proposed arbitration no fewer than six times. In truth, the mere agitation in Venezuela of the question of annexation to the great American republic would in all likelihood bring the English government to terms. One of the last things that Englishmen desire is to have American citizens for neighbors of their lucrative possessions on the mainland of South America and in the Antilles. They are quite sufficiently worried by our proximity to Canada.

M. W. HAZELTINE.

II.

IF the Congress about to assemble reads aright the signs of the times, it will recognize its chief work to be such revision of our currency system as will relieve the Treasury of the tremendous and hurtful strain put upon it by the necessity of maintaining the current redemption of the greenbacks, amounting to $346,000,000, and the Treasury notes issued in the purchase of silver bullion under the requirements of the Sherman law, amounting to about $150,000,000. It is the judgment of the Secretary of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Treasury, as it was of his predecessor, which judgment I am sure is concurred in by an overwhelming majority of all who have given thought to it, that our various forms of money cannot be kept at a parity except by the exchange of gold for these demand notes whenever it is asked for.

Inasmuch as the law requires them to be reissued as fast as they are received, their payment in gold when presented is in no just sense a redemption of them, so that the burden upon the Treasury is never lifted.

Except through taxes or the sale of its bonds, the government has no means of acquiring gold. The enactment of the Sherman law, under which about $50,000,000 of demand notes were required to be annually issued, excited apprehension that the obligations of the Treasury were likely to exceed its ability to maintain their current redemption, that we would be forced to a silver basis whereby the parity of our several forms of money would be destroyed, and that a disastrous collapse of credit would ensue.

Prior to that law so large a proportion of taxes was paid in gold that the Treasury had no difficulty in meeting the demands upon it, but thereafter gold payments began to fall off, and in less than three years ceased altogether. The government was thus compelled to choose between letting the collapse come, or replenishing its gold reserve by selling its bonds. The latter course was pursued with results of inestimable value to the country.

Apprehension has been allayed, it is true, but the state of the gold reserve continues to be a source of constant solicitude.

Exports of gold, no matter for what purpose, beget uneasiness necessarily harmful, and that may at any time develop a threatening condition. This is not through fear that the country may be denuded of its gold stock, for under given trade conditions, exports of gold have always occurred, and will always occur, so long as commerce between nations continues.

Under our system exporters of gold, more easily and economically than by any other method, can procure it from the Treasury by presenting these demand notes for redemption, and it is the apprehension, which will not down, that the day may come when such redemption cannot be made, that creates this solicitude.

It is insisted by some that the trouble does not indicate vice in our system, but that it arises wholly because of insufficient rev-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enue. The answer to this contention is obvious. The demand notes amount in round numbers to $500,000,000. So long as any considerable volume of them is outside of the Treasury, they can and will be used to withdraw whatever gold may be needed for export or otherwise. No revenue would suffice to remove the difficulty, unless ample enough to enable the Treasury to lay these notes aside as they are redeemed or otherwise come into its possession, and defray the expenses of government without paying them out again, for, if reissued, the necessity of providing for their current redemption would remain. Taxation adequate to produce revenue of such magnitude would be intolerable, to say nothing of the dangerous contraction of our circulation that would result. The evil is radical and so must the remedy be. Nothing will answer that does not take from the government the duty of issuing and redeeming demand notes intended to circulate as money. Provision should be made for the gradual retirement of these obligations, and the substitution of bank notes, and this can be safely done, with great advantage both to the government and the people. We have been so long accustomed to government issues that many have forgotten to what extent bank notes formerly figured in our currency. In 1861 very nearly one-half of our circulation consisted of State bank notes, and they continued in use until taxed out of existence in the interest of the National Banks. It would not be difficult for Congress to devise a scheme under which bank notes could be safely allowed to any extent required by the business of the people.

The tax on the issues of State banks should be repealed. The repeal, if deemed desirable, might be accompanied by such conditions as would satisfy the public that their notes would be safe and in all respects entitled to credit. The cost of government bonds is such as to practically preclude the possibility of any material enlargement of the circulation of National Banks. Indeed, they have already become little more than banks of discount and deposit. The National Banking laws might readily be remodeled so that all of their features that are so objectionable to many would be eliminated, and their monopolistic tendencies eradicated. This done, the capacity of National Banks to serve the people by supplying them with a sound and abundant currency would soon place them beyond the reach of criticism or complaint. The Republican party, being now in control of Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gress, is charged with the work of rescuing the country from the dangers threatened by existing currency conditions, and should it fail to do so, it will deserve and receive the severest condemnation.

It should rejoice at the opportunity now afforded it of performing this task, inasmuch as the grave evils to be remedied spring from unsound and ill-conceived laws improvidently, if not recklessly, imposed by them upon the people. Let them now "bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance."

The gold reserve could then be abolished and the Treasury confined to the simple function of collecting and disbursing the revenues. When conditions required it, gold would still be exported, but the exporter would procure it as best he could, and the operation would neither disturb business nor excite comment.

The decision of the Supreme Court that so much of the Wilson bill as sought to lay a tax upon incomes is unconstitutional, has greatly curtailed the revenue contemplated by that law. It cannot as yet be definitely foretold whether or not that law, as it stands, will yield sufficient returns to meet the necessities of the government. So little time has elapsed since it was enacted, and during a considerable part of that time such business depression has prevailed, that no fair judgment can yet be formed of its efficiency. As conditions improve, and as the process of readjustment becomes more complete, it may reasonably be expected that it will yield greater revenue.

It would seem to be the part of wisdom to test it fully in this regard, and, if in the meantime the necessity for larger revenue should manifest itself, to make some temporary provision to supply it. Certainly the business of the country needs assurance that for the present the tariff will not be disturbed.

The question as to whether the government should construct or aid in the construction of the Nicaragua Canal will doubtless be pressed for consideration. Public sentiment has of late years been rapidly crystallizing into a profound conviction that the building of the Canal would in many ways greatly facilitate and advance our commercial interests, and it will not be satisfied unless the project shall receive fair and sympathetic consideration. The question is environed by many difficulties, but it is believed that they are all capable of removal.

The relations between the government and the Pacific rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

roads ought to be adjusted in some way. The indebtedness of these roads to the government is great, and the time has arrived when Congress should determine definitely what steps, if any, can or should be taken to secure it. Many difficulties surround this matter also.

It is contended by some that the government should acquire these roads and operate them on its own account; by some that a compromise should be effected by which a definite sum should be accepted in final settlement of all claims; and by others that the indebtedness should be arranged so that through a long period of time it would be gradually paid in full.

At all events it would seem that a definite settlement of the controversy can no longer be safely postponed.

While it is scarcely probable that any serious quarrel with England will grow out of the Venezuelan dispute, yet if it is not in the meanwhile satisfactorily adjusted it may become necessary to cause inquiry to be made as to whether the situation calls for intervention by the United States.

It is quite likely that Congress will take occasion to reaffirm with emphasis our fixed determination to uphold under all circumstances the principle enunciated by the Monroe Doctrine.

It may also become necessary to take into consideration the situation in Cuba, with the view of determining what the duty of this government is in the premises.

The foregoing are the matters, aside from the regular work of Congress, that seem to be of the greatest importance.

T. C. CATCHINGS.

III.

THE Fifty-first House of Representatives showed what a united party is able to accomplish under intelligent leadership. The Fifty-third Congress, with a party management in both houses, broken by the rivalry of contentious factions, illustrated some of the infirmities of party government without party leadership. In the present condition of national affairs we have a Democratic President, a Republican House, and a Senate in which no party has a majority, and in which on important questions an influential section of each party appears ready to form a coalition against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sound policies. The average citizen is likely to look with suspicion on any proposition in which these three divisions of the legislative function are agreed. The House will experience great difficulty in giving effect to the policy put forward by the administration. A year ago, when the blind spent the winter leading the blind, the Scriptures were literally fulfilled in the fall of both into the ditch. In our present case, if the Secretary of the Treasury again comes forward with a little squad of eastern Democrats in charge of currency reform, we are apt to see the spectacle of the blind trying to lead persons who can see, and the result, so far as the House is concerned, is easy to predict. From the Republican point of view nothing is needed to restore normal business conditions except a full treasury, and a speedy return to favorable trade relations with the world. No possible system of currency can hold out long against a shortage of revenues and an increasing adverse trade balance. If the administration should come forward with some simple proposal to increase the revenue, and some obvious changes in the Act of 1894 looking to a larger patronage of home industries, the Republican party would meet the Secretary of the Treasury more than half way. If we may judge from experience there is little prospect of the present House offering a very hearty indorsement to the elaborate schemes of finance which appear to kindle the imagination of the Secretary. The integrity of his purpose, of course, is not questioned; but there is no extraordinary confidence in the Secretary's career as a popular leader, dealing with the intricate problems of finance. The obligation of the business community to the administration for saving us, albeit in an awkward, humiliating and costly way, from a total wreck of the public credit, incident to the Democratic management of our affairs since 1892, may be admitted. It is a curious commentary on our shifting human affairs, that the maintenance of the specie basis should have been committed to a statesman who declared in the House in 1878, that resumption itself was "a destructive scheme of the bullion dealers"; that the gold reserve has been administered and from time to time replenished, as a general asset of the Treasury, by the doubtful virtue of the act of 1875 through an official who in 1878 declared that it was "a special fund for a special purpose, the redemption and retirement of the legal tender currency," and that the coin collected under it "by the issue and sale of bonds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is dedicated to that one object"; that the same statesman who declared in 1878, that the dropping of the obsolete silver dollar from the list of our legal coins, was a "conspiracy against the human race" and the "most gigantic crime of this or any other age," should have become the confidential adviser of the President and the most active agent of the extreme enemies of silver; that the party leader, who in 1878 announced his purpose to pass one silver bill after another, over the executive veto, even if the House had to suspend its rules, to attach the obnoxious measures to the general appropriation bills, and to starve the government into submission to the free silver movement, should be called upon, as Secretary, to retrace the steps he had advised, and pull the Treasury out of the bottomless pit which his own followers had prepared for it. These things are adverted to not to disparage what the administration has done, but to indicate some of the grounds for Republican hesitation in following a leadership now grown somewhat arrogant and impatient with the slow movements of Congress. The Republican party, being solemnly convinced that the national safety requires Congress to retrace every recent step in the direction of free trade, and that no financial repose is possible without abundant revenues and an adequate protection of domestic industry, is not likely to spend its strength in the House trying to overthrow a system of banking and currency which for fifteen years before the election of 1892 gave the country neither trouble nor anxiety. It would undoubtedly be a good thing to rescue the Treasury from the hands of the gold exporters. It is a better thing to rescue the country from unfavorable business relations which require gold exports. This nation has grown accustomed to a statesmanship that is able to prevent the disease as well as to recognize and treat the symptoms. It would doubtless be a good thing to modify our banking laws, so as to encourage the issue of bank notes, and to otherwise enlarge the commercial usefulness of the National Banks. But nobody, with a history of the United States at hand, expects Congress, under Republican auspices, to join with Mr. Carlisle in a scheme of bank reform, the ultimate effect of which would be to bring back the half-forgotten promissory note factories of the last generation.

It might as well be understood now that whatever money we have in this country shall bear the image and superscription of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the nation of America, and not the mere authority of a State legislature. The American dollar must be as national as the American flag. In whatever the administration proposes, having honestly in view the credit and solvency of the Treasury, it will have the united assistance of the Republican party in Congress. It is not too much to hope that a law may be passed giving the Secretary the power to use the public credit to protect the reserve and to meet the current deficiencies of revenue. It is a national disgrace that the recent Treasury operations, not entirely creditable in themselves, should have been burdened by doubts and disputes as to their legal authority. No nation, which occasionally indulges in the luxury of a Democratic administration, should be without an emergency loan law on its statute books. It is likely to be needed only about once in a generation, but its enactment ought not to be neglected by this Congress. In addition to legislation for the orderly and economical use of the public credit, it is reasonable to expect Congress to provide for the immediate increase of revenue by such modifications of the Act of 1894 as will bring in money enough to pay the current expenses and have a little left over for the sake of the public comfort. Unless the spirit of party and of party faction has made Congress totally helpless, these remedies for an uneasy Treasury will be provided.

It is probable that a general disposition will be manifested in both Houses, not strictly within party lines, to give a substantial expression to the patriotic aspirations of the American people. In all our borders there is a noticeable revival of patriotism—a new sense of the size of the republic, the glory of the American flag, and the dignity of citizenship in the United States. These sentiments have been greatly stimulated by the failure, so far as the public is advised, of our State Department to deal in an influential way with the violation of American rights in distant countries, or to assert the traditions of our fathers in matters which concern the safety and territorial integrity of the struggling little Republics of Central and South America. It is not likely that a nation, which did not withhold its sympathy, more than seventy years ago, from the Greek revolutionists in their effort to cast off the despotism of Turkey, will now find itself entirely without a voice of neighborly good-will in behalf of the people of Cuba, now engaged in defending themselves against the government of Spain, even if the Secretary of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State publishes his proclamations of neutrality, warning the American people to do nothing, while the Attorney-General, following at an humble distance, in an official interview, exhorts them to say nothing. It must always be borne in mind that whatever is attempted by the Congress must be so obviously prudent and patriotic as to escape the rocks of partisan debate, for while the House of Representatives, through the historic public service of Thomas B. Reed, is now able to do what a majority of its members wish to do, the Senate is still at the mercy of the rudest parliamentary weapons of obstruction. The public can count with certainty on no legislative action to which any considerable group of Senators, in the enjoyment of a fair state of health, is really opposed. For that reason the Republican party, being in no position to put any scheme of partisan legislation entirely through, cannot be expected to spend the winter splashing in the water. On the other hand, except the current routine of legislation prepared by the Appropriation Committees, it is not certain that anything will be done. The net result of the election of 1894 is therefore not the enactment of new laws, in harmony with the principles of the Republican party, but rather the grateful sensation, now everywhere felt throughout the business community, that the opportunity of the Democratic party for mischief in national legislation is at an end.

J. P. DOLLIVER.

IV.

THE failure of the Wilson-Gorman tariff act to supply the national government with sufficient revenue to meet current expenses is responsible for the principal problem which will be presented to the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Three issues of bonds, aggregating over $162,000,000, have been made during the past three years, nominally for the purpose of restoring the gold reserve but actually in order to supply the money required for pressing necessities of the Treasury. This cannot long be permitted to continue. Uncle Sam is not accustomed to running into debt in a time of profound peace. Indeed, such a contingency was so far from the thoughts of modern statesmen that no provision was ever made for it; and, instead of a short term emergency bond bearing a low rate of inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

est, the Secretary of the Treasury has been forced to resort to antiquated laws and issue long term and high interest bonds. This position of the Treasury of the United States has been positively humiliating to the average American and has suggested the financial status that obtains at Madrid, Rome, Constantinople and other capitals of bankrupt European powers. Moreover, the history of the bond issue of 1895, when American capitalists were not permitted to bid and the bonds were turned ever *en bloc* to an Anglo-American syndicate, at an enormous profit to the coterie of Wall and Lombard Street bankers so fortunate as to be within the charmed circle, carried with it a suggestion of scandal, which should never again be permitted to attach to the operations of the Treasury of the United States.

Furthermore, the condition of the Treasury sustains intimate relations to the finances of the nation; and, by reason of the gold reserve being considered a portion of the Treasury's assets available for current expenditures, as well as for the one especial purpose for which it was established, every time the reserve has been impaired below the traditional hundred-million mark, apprehension regarding the ability of the government to maintain the interconvertibility of its different forms of money has been aroused, to the detriment of all business and industry.

How shall the present revenue laws be modified in order that the current deficit, which has amounted to about $130,000,000 during the past two years and four months, may be done away with and the government provided with sufficient revenue for current expenses? On that question, of course, the two great parties will divide; and, with a President committed to the tariff ideas which found at least partial expression in the Wilson-Gorman act, with a Senate of uncertain disposition, and with a House fresh from the people and containing an overwhelming majority of Republicans who believe in the American industrial system of protection for home wage-workers, producers and manufacturers, the outcome is uncertain. That the President will urge an increase in the internal revenue tax on beer and ale, if not on other articles which are now or were formerly objects of internal revenue taxation, seems to be accepted on all hands. In this manner he doubtless hopes to make good the loss of revenue which the Supreme Court's decision of unconstitutionality against the income tax provisions of the Wilson-Gorman act involved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The preliminary estimates of the revenue which the proposed tax on income would have yielded were in the neighborhood of $30,000,000. The internal revenue derived from beer and ale taxation last year was approximately $31,000,000; and, as there is little reason to apprehend any material falling off in the consumption of beer and ale, by reason of the proposed increase in the internal revenue tax from $1 to $2 a barrel, probably the expectation of $30,000,000 additional revenue would prove to be well founded.

But, while the Democratic scheme of taxation justifies the proposed increase in the internal revenue tax on beer and ale, Republicans will unquestionably oppose it to the bitter end. They look upon internal revenue taxes as essentially "war taxes," to be reduced or repealed when the revenue emergency which called for their enactment has passed away. Both tariff duties and internal revenue taxes, which were levied by Republicans "for revenue only," have repeatedly been reduced or repealed, when the condition of the Treasury permitted such a reduction in taxation to be made. The pending session of Congress will not witness any departure on the part of Republicans from their historic policy. Undismayed by the result of the popular verdict of 1892, and the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman bill, in which the Democratic party has sought to reduce or repeal tariff duties and make good the resulting deficit in the revenues, by increasing the internal tax on whiskey and levying an internal revenue tax on incomes, the Republicans have steadfastly appealed to the people, in behalf of the American industrial system of protection; and the political results of 1895, no less than those of 1894, encourage them to the belief that the people condemn the Democratic tariff legislation of last year. As wool was the "bloody angle" at which the fight of last summer between protectionists and free-traders was the fiercest, and as the tariff reductionists held their position at that point, despite their retreat from free coal, free iron ore, and other advanced positions which they assumed to occupy, so the protectionists of the Republican House will doubtless seek to repair the damage inflicted on their lines, by restoring wool to the dutiable list.

Under the McKinley tariff act of 1890, without the income tax provision which the Democratic Congress and President sought to embody in the law of 1894, without the increase in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beer and ale tax which the administration now proposes, and despite the reduction of $50,000,000 in the annual revenue which was brought about, the tariff duties and internal revenue taxes yielded sufficient money to meet the current expenses of the government. Republican statesmanship may be relied upon to convert the Wilson-Gorman law into an act which will at once provide sufficient protection for all American wage-workers, producers and manufacturers, and also supply the Treasury with a surplus rather than a deficit. Specific per cents are a matter of incidental importance. The Republican Ways and Means Committee of the House will frame a tariff measure, in harmony and consistency with the principles of the policy of protection, under which the American people prospered as never before in their history, from 1861 to 1893.

That a dead-lock on the tariff question will be precipitated seems altogether likely, if not inevitable. The President is a man of recognized obstinacy of opinion. However, he will have on his hands, during the coming winter, a Congress possessed of equally pronounced views and enjoying the advantage of coming fresh from the people, with positive instructions; and tariff duties, rather than increased internal revenue taxation of beer and ale, will be the plan by which Republicans will seek to relieve the pressing necessities of the Treasury. A presidential veto of the Republican tariff measure will have no other result than to transfer the fight for the restoration of the protective tariff, from the halls of Congress to the presidential and congressional campaign of 1896.

However, all men of conservative views seem agreed that the condition of the Treasury and the credit of the nation should not be imperilled by conflicting ideas regarding the principles which should be observed in levying tariff duties; and the amendment of existing laws, in a manner which will permit the Treasury Department to issue emergency bonds running for a brief period and bearing a low rate of interest, will doubtless meet the views of members who differ most radically on the tariff question.

That important financial legislation, other than this particular provision, will be forthcoming is altogether unlikely. The American people move with deliberation and care in matters of such moment. The congressional elections of 1894 and the State and local contests of 1895, so far as financial considerations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figured in political results, simply manifested popular hostility to the proposition that the mints of the United States should be opened to the free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars at the ratio of 16 to 1. That was the only definite and specific financial proposition which attracted popular attention. The election of an overwhelmingly Republican House of Representatives in 1894 dispelled the free silver menace, which had aroused apprehension both at home and and abroad regarding the stability of American finances. That was a positive advance and a pronounced gain to the cause of sound and honest money. But every attempt at affirmative legislation of a financial character in the present Congress is bound to arouse a multiplicity of conflicting views, probably with the net result that beyond the formulation of various measures designed to reform the existing currency system and their extended advocacy nothing will be accomplished.

However, it should be borne in mind, in this connection, that from the day of the resumption of specie payments, January 1, 1879, as long as the tariff duties and internal revenue taxes yielded sufficient revenue for Treasury purposes—indeed, until the time of Democracy's advent to power at Washington in March, 1893, the panic which followed and the Wilson-Gorman tariff act—the existing financial system worked acceptably and well. A deficit in revenue and an impairment of the gold reserve, along with many disturbing influences in financial, commercial and industrial circles, were required to reveal the defects and weaknesses in the system. These have unquestionably influenced popular sentiment in demanding an improvement which will meet recent conditions and requirements. Conservative opinion, it will probably be discovered, will favor making haste slowly in this matter. Financial legislation, on the eve of a presidential election and in the absence of any crystallization of sentiment and purpose, would hardly be of a desirable character. Gold monometallism, international bimetallism, and independent action in the direction of free silver coinage represent only the general positions and not the subdivisions of financial views, which will find expression in the present Congress.

That the Republican House of Representatives will respond to party sentiment in favor of extending all proper and permissible encouragement to the struggling patriots of Cuba, and,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likewise, in favor of the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine wherever on the American Continent foreign encroachment shall seek to infringe it, goes without saying.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that, barring sensational developments in other directions, the present House will be the battle-ground where the great questions of tariff and finance will be the issues, pending the time when the contest shall be transferred to the vast field where the Presidential and Congressional struggle of 1896 will be fought and determined.

GEORGE N. SOUTHWICK.

V.

THERE will probably be a marked difference between what the next Congress will do and what the great mass of the people think it should do. The producing portion of the nation who feed, clothe and house the race, think that some of their long neglected natural rights should be declared and enforced, but no heed will be given to their convictions.

The floating signs indicate that a few bombastic assumptions of patriotism and a liberal number of Congressional bluffs at the gathering war clouds, with a profuse abuse of the State Department and the President, will usher in the session. The two great parties will play the role of King Lear's elder daughters in outvieing each other in protestations of loyalty. Their final conduct will prove that such declarations were but harmless peals of the political gong. All the necessary declarations of belligerency will be unanimously adopted, the Monroe Doctrine will be re-declared with great acclamation, and much indignation will be expressed for the neglected past. Many other such pleasing matters will be attended to promptly that will not materially affect the industrial or business condition of the country.

As long as the people can be contented with empty shadows, the substance of things will be handed over to that class which will accept nothing less than the substance of things. It is generally conceded that a Congress has been secured thoroughly imbued with the prevailing economic ideas of the New England and Middle States. This assures such an organization of the House Committees that no financial legislation can emanate from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance or Banking Committee not of the "sound money" type, no tariff measure or provision to increase the revenue of the government can emerge from the Ways and Means Committee except of the high tariff order, and the organization of the Commitees on Territories will be such that no recognition of the claims of Statehood of New Mexico, Arizona and Oklahoma will be countenanced, and a like eastern policy will be pursued throughout all of the committees.

This will be unfortunate for the country at large, as it will evince conclusively the intense sectionalism of these States from which comes a general flow of the loudest deprecations of any indication of sectionalism. To maintain the homogeneity of the people of a great country every thought and act of the representatives in Congress should be as broad as the country itself, but human nature seems to be too weak to reach this standard.

The Nicaragua Canal should be built, if the ownershi or complete control can be secured and maintained b the government. We cannot afford to subsidize any private corporation and open the doors for a repetition of the Pacific railroad frauds and national scandals.

The lien on the Pacific roads should be foreclosed at once, the government own the roads, if need be, and operate or lease them in the interest of the people. The nation cannot afford to keep this vile book of public scandal and private disgrace open before the people longer, even if its soiled lids must be closed at a loss to the government.

The real contest in the coming Congress will be the determined effort which the administration will make to retire the greenback, and increase the interest-bearing debt and the bankers' profits and privileges. On one side of this issue will be found the administration and the representatives of the great money centres of the country without regard to political affiliations. On the other side will be the great body of the non-interest-drawing but great interest-paying portion of the people.

The results of every evolution of our greenback and bonded systems have been so beneficial to the professional banker and dealers in ready money and government securities, that the people at large have logically concluded that our financial operations since the Rebellion have not been based upon broad, unselfish, patriotic statesmanship and have not been for the greatest good

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the greatest number, but have been rather built up by a narrow, selfish line of specialists who so handle money and securities as to make the largest possible private gains at the expense of the public; the government thereby becoming financially subordinate to and dependent upon the private capitalists for its financial life and liberty.

The unprecedented number of great fortunes accumulated by bankers and dealers in ready money and securities during the past thirty years demands of the representatives of the people a critical investigation of the methods used in reaching the difference gradations leading up to our unfortunate financial condition.

The greenback system originated in and passed the House, providing for a full legal tender paper money. The Senate so amended the bill that it was not a legal tender for the interest on the public debt, or receivable for import duties. I will offer in evidence, as showing for whose benefit this amendment was made, a few lines of a speech of Thaddeus Stevens in the House, February 20, 1862, and like speeches were made by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Morton and many others. He says: "I have a melancholy foreboding that we are about to consummate a cunningly devised scheme which will carry great injury and great loss to all classes of people throughout this Union, except one." He declared that the people generally approved the bill as it passed the House, but that "there was a doleful sound came up from caverns of the bullion brokers, and of salons of the associated banks" that caused the Senate to so amend the bill as to "make two kinds of money: one for banks and brokers and one for the people." The passage of this bill made a forced market for the coin of the capitalist; he ran it to a premium, bought up the greenbacks at an average of sixty odd cents on the dollar, secured an act of Congress permitting him to exchange them for interest-bearing bonds at par, and obtained the passage of the national banking act built upon the bonded debt—all of which soon brought his government bonds to a premium.

The interest only of the bonds was made payable in coin; the principal was payable in any kind of legal tender money. The bank journals, the sympathizing public press and the bondholders soon started an outcry, in the name of patriotism and the public credit, that the principal of the bond ought to be paid in coin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The National Republican Convention of 1868 resolved, among many other things : "That we denounce all forms of repudiation as a national crime ; and the national honor requires the payment of the national debt in the utmost good faith to all creditors at home and abroad, not only according to the letter but according to the spirit of the contract." In the subsequent Congresses the Republicans declared the "spirit of the contract" with the bondholder meant coin, but they could find no such spirit in the agreements with the soldier or everyday citizen. They soon passed a bill making all bonds payable in coin of the standard value of July 17th, 1870. In 1873 Congress demonetized silver, and the bondholder then contended that his bond was payable in gold. To settle this, Congress passed a joint resolution in 1877, declaring all obligations of the government payable in gold or silver at the option of the government.

Then the so-called "Honest Money League" appealed to the Secretary of the Treasury, in the name of the public credit, to reverse the universal law of tender, and to allow the creditor to choose the kind of money he would accept. His request was readily granted, which took away the legal tender quality of our coined silver when payments were to be made on a bond or bill, and voluntarily destroyed the right to pay in silver as provided in the Act of 1870. This last act of the Secretary of the Treasury, allowing the creditor to choose the kind of money he would accept on a bond or greenback, is the pith, bone and sinew of every trouble or annoyance that the Treasury Department has had with the gold reserve or with the greenback. This supposed malady can be removed by simply going back to the correct principle and paying all public obligations in any kind of legal tender money that is most convenient to the government. The correct principle is followed in France, and in all other governments having more than one kind of legal tender money, with a perfect success. It does seem that for the past quarter of a century financial legerdemain, that has greatly enriched the money dealer and impoverished and humiliated the government, has taken the place of good governmental financiering. Party platforms and political convictions of public men have become as "erratic as the phantasm of a morning dream."

With a Democratic administration advocating a single gold standard and an unbridled bank currency in the face of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teachings of the party for nearly a century, viz: "We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes . . . because gold and silver is the only safe and constitutional currency," and with the great Republican party entrenched in Congress advocating the same ruinous doctrine in the face of the teachings of the patriotic Lincoln who largely enunciated the original principles of the party, and who unerringly taught that "if a government contracts a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contracts the money volume before the debt is paid, it is the most heinous crime a nation can commit against a people"—we can rely upon no past by which we can safely judge the future. However, it is to be hoped that something better than present indications portend may emerge from the chaotic elements that constitute this Congress. As the great heads of the lamb and the lion seem inclined to lie down together in harmony and in a new lair, it may be fondly hoped that, with the aid of the people and an enlightened press, the usual bombast and political claptrap in the sessions preceding the presidential elections may be eliminated, and as healthy a stimulus given to business as existing conditions will permit during the presidential canvass and election. The people out of Congress should by a forced, healthy business sentiment forestall any depression of business at the beckoning of any line of politicians or in the interest of any political combination. The crowning curse of the nation is traceable to the unbridled tread of the mere politician. With all of the confusing shuffling of the age, let the people forge to the front and direct the destiny of the succeeding years in the interest of industry instead of in the interest of the professional politicians.

JOHN C. BELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRANKS AND CRAZES.

BY MRS. LYNN LINTON.

IMAGINATION is by far the strongest faculty of the human mind; and the world which each man makes for himself is more real than the things of time and sense. Hence, society has never wanted for cranks to whom black is white and the pyramid rests on its apex; and crazes, able to attract their thousands, have ever run like wild-fire through the land. We see this in the very beginnings of society, when man first endeavors to frame a theory of the universe and his relations with the unseen. In the Obi-man and the witch-finder of the savage; in his elaborate system of taboo and his fear of, because his belief in, ghosts; in his impressibility by dreams, and his idea that what is simply the automatic action of the brain is a real thing, an objective drama wherein his errant soul plays the part of audience; in his religion and his beliefs—this faculty of the imagination with the primitive man is supreme: and, working upward from him, so do we find it everywhere, graduated according to education or ignorance, strength of mind or feebleness of wit.

To reason with a crank is to carry water in a sieve. He is incapable of reasoning on any subject whatever. He has "realized" this or that, and when he has once done this, though change, with its consequent sanity, may come, it is not very likely that it will. The kink in the brain which has produced this condition of thought is more likely to be permanent than transient; and the crank with a theory, the crank with a faith unprovable by evidence, or one with personal ambition, a personal grievance or a "mission" self-evolved, is to all intents a lunatic and may be a dangerous one into the bargain. History shows this, from Ravaillac's time and before; and more than the one crime of burning the Temple of Diana has been committed by madmen as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crazily desirous of perpetuating their names as was ever that infamous Ephesian. Not so many years ago, indeed, a young fellow committed a barbarous murder, with the avowed desire of "making all England ring with his name"—this being his idea of glory and renown. Perfect mental sanity is just the hardest thing to find among men. Genius, wit, imagination, and all the intellectual faculties cultivated to the highest point, these we can find without the need of a lanthorn; but that exact mental equilibrium, that flawless self-possession, which is mental sanity—here we are like those who seek for a buried treasure, which exists, but where?

What is true of individual cranks, is true of more widely dispersed crazes. Of these each age has its special portion. Now it is the Crusades and now the discovery of the North Pole. Now it is the end of the world as prophesied by Solomon Eagle and Dr. Cumming, and now it is the Millennium which is to come with to-morrow's sun, when no eagle shall pounce on any leveret, no owl shall go a-mousing o' nights, no man shall die, and no tillage shall be necessary for the full vintage of the rich harvest. This belief in the Millennium has long been a favorite craze with many. It is on a par with that reappearance of popular leaders and heroes, which consoled the desolate adherents when death claimed his tribute and the Great Charles, like Frederic Barbarossa and our own King Arthur, *inter alia,* died the death of ordinary men to be resuscitated as the elect, when their night had passed and their day had dawned again. How those who believe in this blissful state of universal peace and joy and deathlessness and the union of lions and lambs can reconcile this dream with the stern facts of life as we know it; how they can believe that this shifting phantasmagoria, where all old things are being forever ground up into new, can become as stable and unchanging as a Heaven of brass and an earth of iron; how they can believe in the universal suspension of all activities, all changes—seems to those not influenced by that craze one of the most extraordinary delusions of Hope which Imagination ever wrought. But many do so believe it—in the rough—as a sketch. They do not care to go into details and to work out for themselves the problem of this universal suspension—this unchanging stability of condition. They leave that to the Great God who is to arrange it all, and have no doubt but that He can so order all things as to make that life which is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essentially fluid, shifting, and incessantly reproductive, as fixed and unchangeable as a crystal imbedded in a rock. That is, Law has no meaning for them, experience no lessons, and the miraculous is the only certainty.

Theosophy and all the phenomena of spiritualism follow on the same line. Their very impossibility feeds the craze; and *credo quia impossibile* is the motto of the sect. That a set of unknown men living in the obscure valleys of Thibet and calling themselves Mahatmas, should be able to set all the laws of nature at defiance has a fascination for some which they are unable to resist. These, the Masters of Nature, are, according to some, the makers of storms and tempests and the creators of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. They are the managers who pull the strings, and the Forces of Nature are the marionettes they make dance as they list. They have conquered the difficulty of solids passing through solids, and have annihilated time and space. Their letters written on purchasable Indian writing paper—whereof "Madame" had a large store—can fly unseen from Thibet to London where they fall from the ceiling into the lap of the high priestess. They themselves appear to their believers in the gloaming, and weave turbans of nice fine Manchester cloth out of the viewless air. They live to a fabulous old age, retaining their comparative youth and good looks to the last, so that a sage of ninety looks like a handsome man of forty, and one at sixty has the flesh and skin of twenty-five or thirty. To this add the doctrine of re-incarnation, which, as with the elephant that stands on the tortoise, removes by one stage the mystery of a living soul or ever the body took shape for its habitation.

Add, too, the belief that a man can evolve out of his own body a materialized spirit which, first appearing as a nebulous mass, gradually takes the form and substance of a concrete human being who walks about the room, talks in English, sometimes of a doubtful kind, takes your hand in his—and his is as warm and substantial as your own—and finally sinks to the floor and dissolves once more into nebulosity and nothingness.

These are among the crazes which sane people believe—these, with colloquies and revelations from ghosts, and communications from spirits who can give you a world of unprovable information, but who were baffled by the mystery of Jack the Ripper, and, able to see what is passing in a private house in India, are unable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to read the number of that bank-note within a securely fastened envelope.

The craze of spiritualism, in its last developments, is perhaps one of the most astounding instances of human superstition known to us. The auguries drawn from the sacred chickens and the flight of birds, dear to the Romans, were strange enough; but that sane, wise, learned men should suffer themselves to be tricked by a few artful ventriloquists and one-trick conjurers is something that strikes those who do not share this belief as the only marvel of the thing.

This proneness to accept superstition and fancies for proved facts is as old as human nature, and has been one of the most fruitful of all the harvests reaped by the astute and unscrupulous in the garths of the credulous and imaginative. It is not a thing of to-day, nor of England only. It is older than the Eleusinian mysteries, than the serpent rods of the Egyptian sorcerers, than the advent of Oannes or the peopling of the world by dragon's teeth. It is a craze as persistent as thought, and will ever be, while we are ignorant of our true relations with the universe. For it is the outcome of spiritual desire, the embodied expression of that stretching out of our hands towards the Unknown—of that fruitless endeavor to grasp the truth which eludes us, that makes half the charm and half the pathos of thought. It is a craze all the same, and when carried to excess it is as dangerous as it is humiliating and fallacious.

Certain modern crazes fall far below this in what may be called the poetry of delusion—the dignity of hallucination—though one, at least, has an aura of nobleness, which, in some instances, redeems it from rank mischief. We mean the modern craze for missionary work in unlikely and unsympathetic countries, where the lives of the missionaries are in danger, where the converts they make are, for the most part, unredeemed scoundrels, and where the civilization of the people is older and more compact than our own, better suited to the needs of the people, and of the kind wherein morality, customs and religion are all as closely and inextricably intertwined as the fibres of a plant. Separate them and you destroy the whole structure. But this argument has no effect on those whose craze it is to carry the Bible into the far East and so turn bad Buddhists into worse Christians. Nor does it give them pause that by their rash action—self-sacrificing if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you will, but none the less impertinent and meddlesome—they may create a war among the nations wherein thousands on thousands will be sacrificed. The missionary craze has no respect for ultimates, beyond that doubtful gain of inducing a Chinaman to repeat the Apostles' creed instead of chin-chinning Joss—of substituting for the Brahmin's belief in the genesis of man from the body of the god, the story of the clay figure and the abstracted rib. For all the misery and murder that may follow his tampering with established faiths—for all the unsatisfactory nature of the conversions he may make—he goes on in the old path, and shuts his eyes to the evil he so diligently effects. He is impelled by the craze of interference, and reason is as a dumb dog while he careers over the ground mounted on the hippogriff of an impracticable and a mischievous enthusiasm.

The same kind of craze makes people take up any extraneous cause, whether they understand it in its entirety or not. The love of acting Providence is so great with some! Now we must trounce the Unspeakable Turk for his dealings with his Christian subjects; and not the biggest duck that flies about the world of rumor is too big for us to swallow. We do not stop to inquire before we condemn, and while the sager and cooler among us would hesitate before taking action on an *ex parte* statement, not sifted to the bottom, the cranks for the sake of humanity, and those who are crazy to be as a potent Providence sailing over the seas in ironclads, insist on an instant and unanswerable demonstration—on the thrusting of the hand, wrist-deep, into the pie with which they and we have no concern. That valuable doctrine of letting alone has no meaning for those cranks eager to mind everybody's business but their own; and that significant clock will certainly never be given to the English-speaking peoples while they are so intent on playing Providence and following in the footsteps of Don Quixote.

Going still a step lower, what queer crazes take possession of the public taste! Take cycling as an example. Walking, riding, skating, and dancing we can understand as fit exercise for the vigorous and young; driving is precious to the indolent and the delicate; but cycling seems to be such a doubtful kind of amusement—such a queer cross between the treadmill and the tight-rope—demanding such a constant strain of attention to keep your balance, with such a monotonous and restricted action

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the limbs as to render it a work of penance rather than of pleasure. To be sure there is the enjoyment of rapid motion through the air; and there must be something in the very lightness of the machine, the very exiguity of seat and tackle which creates a charm. But to the uninitiated the craze which has swept over England seems inconceivable; and, as a substitute for the horse and the carriage and one's own two feet, these uninitiated place the bicycle nowhere. It is invaluable as a cheap mode of locomotion for those who cannot afford to keep a horse and who want to go further afield than their own walking powers will take them; but for those who can afford horses and carriages and Pullman cars and all the rest of it, a wheeled treadmill seems but a queer kind of vehicle, and its popularity counts among the things which no fellow can understand. And those crazy cycling tours around the world, how mad they are! about as mad as the champion globe-trotter who flies through every country at express speed; as the man who undertakes to wheel his wife in a wheel barrow from the Land's End to John o'Groat's; as the man who goes over Niagara Falls in a barrel; or he who crosses the Atlantic in an open boat with only a dog for his mate.

A craze, too, when it broke out, was the sudden *engouement* for coster songs, which nothing but the genius of Chevalier excused, and which, without him, were detestable. A craze that had its graver side was the effeminate young man's passion for bric-à-brac, the worship of sunflowers and lilies, and the desire to live up to his blue china. He was a weak and puny creature when he began; when he culminated in the Yellow Book and certain illustrations he was something worse. That, too, is a craze like any other; and the sudden, the un-English apotheosis of licentious literature and art counts as one of the most extraordinary, as well as regrettable, outbreaks of modern times. And as everything has its shadow, and the swing of the pendulum to the left is in exact ratio with that of its swing to the right, the Yellow Book and all its congeners have fostered, if not produced, the corresponding craze of Prurient Prudery, when again that haunting desire to put their fingers, unasked, into pies not belonging to them, makes intermeddling cranks of honest citizens, and brings virtue into disrepute because of the unloveliness of its advocates.

Cheapness comes into the category of modern crazes—cheap things however produced—cheapness got by the sweating of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands and the poorness of the material, by tears and starvation here, by disappointment and untrustworthiness there. But it is a craze, and we have to go through with it. Its offset and its origin—at once cause and effect—is the craze for those huge emporia which eat up the small private tradesman in the locality even as the Lamb of the Steppes eats up all the herbage round its fatal growth. It would be interesting, instructive, and tragical, to learn how many bankrupts and how many broken-hearts and ruined lives have been made by these huge emporia—how many "hands" have been driven to suicide or to drink by sheer despair of ill-paid work and indecent poverty joined with crushing toil—how many honest workmen have been thrown on the rates because of unemployment, while Germany, France and Switzerland send their cheaper products by the shipload, and the public greedily buys for a shilling an inferior thing made abroad for which, if English, they would pay perhaps fourteen pence. The odd twopence goes in the way of rates and charities; but this is a calculation beyond the power of the craze-afflicted, and the round of wrong goes on without a break in its vicious circle.

A craze that has got to bear its ultimate fruit is our modern high-class education for the working classes, those who have to gain their bread by their handiwork and to whom, therefore, specialized and technical instruction would seem to be more necessary than generalized and purely intellectual. A lad destined to be a carpenter would surely do better if taught to handle his tools betimes and instructed in the mysteries of rabbeting and mortising, of dovetailing and planing, rather than in the details of osteology or the curiosities of botany. And a girl who has to be a cook might be taught how to boil potatoes, with greater advantage to her future, than how to play the piano or to sing in part songs. On this craze, however, it becomes us to keep a discreet silence. It is idle to prophesy, and until we see the results we cannot be sure that the thing is for good or evil.

It may raise the whole nation into a higher level, keeping the relative gradations intact; or it may throw the whole thing out of gear and into confusion, and produce a time of social chaos, destructive of all growth and good. *Quien sabe?* On the knees of the gods lies the answer to the question, and there we must leave it till Time and the Future unfold it.

E. Lynn Linton.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAST GIFT OF THE CENTURY.

BY N. S. SHALER.

ONE of the most curious consequences arising from the ten fingers of man is the decimal system of notation. From this, among many other things, has arisen the division of the historic ages into centuries. At first these periods of one hundred years had no other estimation among the masses than that which came from their convenience. The passage from one of these epochs to another was practically unnoticed, but in our times the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth of these spans is awaited with a remarkable emotional as well as intellectual interest. Even among the masses of our folk we find all intelligent persons looking back over the triumphs of their time with satisfaction, and forward with much expectation to the gains which they and their successors may hope to win in the next great division of the years.

This sympathetic absorption in the affairs of their kind is indeed the greatest and the most widespread of all the triumphs which civilized man has won from his experience in the century which is passing away. There is fortunately an excellent foundation for all the gratulation and hope which men may be minded to seek in the onward march of the world during the last three generations. In this period the winnings in the moral and physical fields of social development may be well set against the thousand years which came before. The abolition of slavery, the establishment, in a great variety of forms, of personal liberty, the extension of the comity of nations, as well as the vast and swiftly extending march of invention and discovery in the material realm, justify the pride of those who have had a share in the great accomplishment, and warrant the fervid anticipation of the future which animates the millions on both sides of the Atlantic.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is evident that the civilized world, through the review and forecast which the end of this nineteenth century has enforced, is rapidly entering upon a state of sympathetic exaltation, the like of which has not been known since the end of the first thousand years, when all Europe awaited the millennium as the time when the earth was to pass away. In that old day it was despair; in this it is an inspiring desire to achieve. Such psychological moments are the rarest things of the world; they afford to the true philanthropist the precious occasions to contrive for the effective advance of man. Properly used, this critical period may afford the occasion for remedying the greatest of all human ills, which has been left untouched by all the benefits which our age has won. This evil is war.

The historian of the nineteenth century will need to look closely if he is to understand the conditions which led to such momentous gains as it has achieved, while they left the greatest and most senseless of human ills quite without relief. It is likely that the explanation of this surprising state is to be found in the slow extinction of the ancient and therefore abiding prejudices which separate the races, the nations, the tongues, and the creeds; in the prepossessions and interests arising from the maintenance of military castes; and in the exceeding difficulty which has been encountered in forcing the public opinion of this time through the walls of tradition that encompass governments. The spiritual awakening of the moment, that promises to be the greater in the immediately forthcoming years, affords a singularly favorable opportunity to those who would work for peace. Properly used, it may be made the occasion for the creation of a motive, and a system resting thereon, which, within the days of those who take part in the good work, may practically do away with the worst of human misfortunes.

Properly to use this opportunity to make for peace, two things are evidently desirable; in the first place, those who are devoting themselves to the cause should endeavor to extend their propaganda not through vaporous congresses, which by their successive and absurd failures give an intangible air to the whole endeavor, but by means of a determined system of education, which shall bring before the youth a true sense of the moral and economic abominations of war. It should be recognized that the military motive had been fixed in the inheritances of our race by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ages of habit, and perhaps also by the process of natural selection, which in the olden days led to the survival of the most militant tribes to be the foundations of our present states. It should be perceived that our literature is as a gospel of combat to young and ardent spirits. There is scarcely a bit of good writing which is likely to meet the eyes of ordinary readers which paints war as it really is. The Old Testament is one of the worst offenders in this praise of battle. Although, in common with most sensible people, the reader is probably to be ranked with those who believe that there are sundry things much worse than the slaying of men, and that, under certain conditions, campaigns may well be waged with all the consequent loss of life and destruction of the gains that life wins, it may be assumed that he regards the present status as an abominable condition of things, where national vanity, the lust of power, or ancient hatred, keeps the civilized world in a state of continued crises, in which an explosion is always imminent. The aim of the rational element of our population should be not to reduce men to be passive lovers of mere existence, mere non-resistants; to accomplish this end is fortunately impossible, and ostensibly to seek it is to bring the movement for peace into discredit with those who estimate the possessions of their civilization at their real value. The rational and hopeful object should be to show war in its true light as a relic of savagery, which has been enabled to survive in our civilizations mainly because of the rhetorical and artistic trappings which hide its true shameful aspect from the understanding.

To make head against the influences which serve to propagate the love of war it seems necessary to begin the task in our school system. Already there is some foundation for teaching of this sort in the instruction which is now being essayed concerning the rights and duties of the citizen. It will be a simple and appropriate addition to this good work to set forth the actual nature and effects of armed contests. If the task were properly done every youth would be brought to see the nobility and dignity of civilization and the destruction that war makes in it. It would be made plain to him that the better men of his time regard it as preposterous, and in a way disgraceful, to go ever armed with deadly weapons against the remote possibility of some ruffianly assault; it is the ruffian alone who clings to this ancient brutal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way; he is not to be reckoned with in any decent society. A slight extension of the same conception will make it clear to the youth that any collection of people which maintains a vast standing army simply that it may thus better be able to assail its neighbors, is in the position of a man who goes about his peaceful occupations in readiness for slaying his fellows. There can be no doubt that the time has come for the deliberate and systematic teaching of those truths which will serve to build in the minds of the people right notions as to the relation of violence to societies. We have trusted too much to the secondary effects of advancing culture to keep down the old evil of militarism. We have relied on the absence of a great standing army and on the uses of peace to develop among our own citizens a horror of war, yet with the shadow of the greatest conflict of modern days still upon us, we find the leading representatives of a great party, even men who have been exposed to all the cultivating influences which our country can afford, who know, or who have had every opportunity to comprehend, the misery which war entails, yet who are ever seeking to embroil their own nation with others. It needs but a glance at the records of the last Congress to show that our law-givers lack all sense of what they are seeking, when they clamor for war as a means of vengeance or of national self-assertion. We need to breed up men who have a more civilized view of human relations.

While the review of this century and the forecast of the next may well lead us to determined effort toward the education of our people away from the old irrational inhuman motives which led them to look upon warfare as a natural and ready instrument for the settlement of disputes, there is another and more immediate means by which we may hope to take an important step towards international concord. To set forth this means is the main object of this writing. As before remarked, this last hundred years has mended or at least bettered the lot of man in almost every regard except in the frequency and destructiveness of its wars. There may have been centuries in which this Moloch has demanded a larger share of the people in sacrifice, but there have probably been none in which the aggregate tax on life and property has been so great, or in which there has been less in the way of profit to show for the destruction. It is assuredly most fit that we should do what we can to establish some international body which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall at least set about the task of devising the means whereby we may hope to begin the new account of years with the prospect of bettering the conditions. This undertaking can be most fitly proposed by our own country, for the reason that while we have an unhappy history for a peace loving people there can be no doubt that, with the exception of the Mexican war, none of our conflicts have had conquests for their object. We have shown an eminent capacity for military work by waging the greatest civil war the world has ever known, and we have in the Alabama negotiations settled a dispute which in the ordinary conduct of international affairs would have resulted in an armed conflict. The policy of our government, as determined by an overwhelming majority of our people, is undoubtedly that of peace. We have no basis for quarrels with our neighbors; it is hardly to be conceived that any will arise which will not be settled in an amicable manner. These facts make it fit that our federal authorities should take the lead in the good work by extending an invitation to the leading states of the civilized world to join in an official international congress, having for its purpose the establishment of some convention to diminish the danger of war-like contests.

At first sight it may seem futile for this or any other government to undertake to promote an official gathering of delegates from the leading European powers, with the hope of restricting the exercise of that right which from the beginning of states has been held to be absolutely within the bounds of their individual judgments. In the present conditions of human nature, it is not to be expected that any nation will give to any commission a right to restrict the liberty to expend its blood and treasure in any cause which may seem to its people to justify the sacrifice. Accepting this limitation, as we needs must do, let us see whether there remains enough in the way of possible good to justify the endeavor which has just been recommended.

Let us suppose that our government, by an act of its Congress, should invite the other first-class powers, say those to which it sends ambassadors, to appoint each three delegates to meet those from this country in Washington, on the 1st of January, 1897, the object being to see what may be done to diminish the danger of armed contests. It may fairly be reckoned that the object of the movement will commend itself to the minds of all intelligent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people and that the greater number, if not all, of the states which are bidden to the assembly, will accept the invitation. It being assumed, as above suggested, that it is out of the question directly to limit the initiation in the matter of declaration of war, what are the recommendations which this commission of enquiry could possibly make that would justify the meeting ?

It seems not unreasonable to suggest that the conference might advise the institution of a permanent international peace commission, composed of delegates from the several national authorities, which should hold annual sessions and which could be called together whenever it became evident that there was danger of a warlike contest between any of the contracting parties, this permanent commission to have no actual powers except those of mediation preceding or during a conflict, and of suggestions concerning limitations or the reduction of standing armies and navies. The arrangement for the use of the influence of the commission might well be as follows : The several states might agree that, in a case of impending warlike outbreak between any two members of the association, the commission might send a delegate or delegates from its members whose efforts at mediation should be heard before the declaration of war. This commission might furthermore agree to consider the recommendations for progressive disarmament at some definite and proportional rate, or for the replacement of standing armies by an organized militia, say of the Swiss type. The considerations may extend to the point of submitting the propositions to the legislature or other bodies which have charge of the budgets of the several states, there being no guarantee given that the government concerned shall approve of the propositions as submitted by the commission. It might be well to charge the commission with the task of bettering the statement of the body of customs which is termed international law ; it is possible that in course of time something like effective codification of these usages might be brought about.

At first sight it may seem that a body of men however much weight they might have from their individual value would be without influence, because without the slightest power to make their decisions felt. But the essence of the strength which such a commission would possess would come from its having a chance to concentrate public opinion in favor of arbitration. This public opinion is now so strong that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even the most despotic of the civilized governments feels its influence in the conduct of affairs. The action of this opinion is felt not only from within; every state which may be termed civilized earnestly desires the approval of the neighbors with which it is linked in the relation of commerce. We may indeed take the amount of this sympathetic spirit as the best possible index as to the measure of civilization to which a people has attained. There would be strength enough in the commission to bring this public opinion to a distinct and authoritative form: it may be presumed that in many if not most instances it would be ineffective in preventing war, but it would certainly add much to the influences which make against the occurrence of these disasters.

We may profitably imagine the steps which the international board of arbitration would take in case there was evident danger of trouble between two of the states in the league. When the situation became critical the commission would be called together. Its assembling would be in some cases perhaps due to the suggestions of the parties in dispute, its place of meeting would be on the nearest neutral ground, say in general in Switzerland. As it may be supposed that the persons representing the several states would be men of great weight, in general distinguished diplomats, the meeting would of itself have a decided effect in calling attention to the desirability of arbitration. From the commission there would be sent to the authorities of the endangered states delegates who, by the agreement, would have to be heard. The presence of an accredited messenger of peace in a capital where the war spirit was high might not be welcome; but it would be in some large measure effective. By the contract this messenger would have a right to be heard, and his suggestions made in conference with the delegate or delegates acting at the other court would assuredly make for delay in the declaration of war. It is, of course, conceivable, in fact eminently probable, that in some cases the authorities would repudiate the contract, and send the delegate about his business, or his advice would be avoided, yet we may be sure in any probable conditions a government, however desirous of beginning a war, would hesitate to incur the odium which would arise from taking such a course; they would probably try to manage the situation; this would make for delay and and delay would make for peace. Assuming the worst possible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

result, that in which the efforts of the delegates were quite ineffective, we have a burden laid upon one or both of the combatants which would be hard to bear in face of the criticism of the better people of other countries. They would be in the position of men who had fired on a flag of truce.

Supposing that nothing could be done to prevent the outbreak of war, the commission could still look forward with some hope to lessening the duration of the strife. There have been many occasions in which a neutral power has been able with advantage to mediate between combatants and to lessen the dangers of long continued conflict. This mediation, coming not from single governments, but from a congress representing the civilized world, would have singular weight, and, we may presume, a degree of efficiency which would not be attainable when essayed by any one state. As we may presume that the delegates in the commission would be in communication with the several governments, each tender of peace would represent the motives of them all. Thus before and after the declaration of hostilities, the proposed board would bring to bear on the situation the moral force of the world, a force which is now very strong for peace, and which will be greatly increased in strength whenever an efficient system for its application is established.

Although there is much to hope from the action of a peace commission in the crisis of war, it is likely that its usefulness in treating with the conditions which favor conflict may be even more important. The principal instigation to armed conflict is the continued and competitive preparation for it; it is perfectly natural that a state possessing a vast and costly war engine, ever ready to be directed against its neighbors, should desire from time to time to ascertain the strength of its cherished power. It would be beyond the limits of human nature if a body of officers containing tens of thousands of the ablest and most ardent men of this generation should not long for the opportunity to do the deeds for which their lives are a preparation. There can be no question that standing armies of the proportion which these hosts have taken on in modern continental Europe are in a high degree provocative of wars; every plan which contemplates a reduction of this danger by a systematic and mutual decrease of the permanent forces of the several states would be sure to be received with interest. So far there has been no opportunity for the prosecution of a plan for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a reduction of standing armies; none of the governments which are concerned would be inclined to take the initiative in the process even by calling a conference to consider the question, for by so doing it would confess the seriousness of the burden which weighs so heavily on them all.

We might reasonably look to a permanent peace commission for a plan as to the reduction of standing armies and navies which would have a chance to be adopted. This project might include a scaling down of the annual levy to a determined per cent., so that at the end of a certain number of years, the men continually under arms in any one state should not exceed say one soldier to each one thousand of the population. This would leave the several governments free to organize a high grade, easily mobilized, militia, on the basis of the Swiss system, a body of troops nearly as efficient for purposes of defence as a standing army of like size, but which can be kept in a tolerably good state by a sacrifice of not more than one month of each year in camp, a tax on their time which would not deprive the men of their places in industrial pursuits. Those who have seen bodies of the Swiss citizen soldiers will, if they have a judgment in such matters, agree with the assertion that they are likely to prove as useful in protecting their country as equal numbers of the most elaborately trained men from any part of Europe. The advantage of a militia in the interests of peace is found in the fact that the men never become imbued with the war spirit; they look upon the military side of their life as an incident; they are men of peaceful callings, and have the instincts which belong to such people, but which are foreign to the professional soldier. They are willing to bear arms for the one cause which really warrants war—the protection of their country from invasion.

The burden of standing armies, directly upon the budget and indirectly upon productiveness of the people, is now so patent to all the statesmen of Europe that there is a reasonable chance for the favorable reception of a proposition to effect a proportional reduction of their permanent forces. The need is to have some tolerably independent source whence these suggestions can come, a source with the moral authority, at least, to enforce any understanding which might be entered into. It is possible that a commission such as is suggested might not be able to contrive an agreement at once, but a plan if well matured would concentrate the atten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of people upon one of the means by which the risks of war could be diminished. If the board were to be given a life of ten years and should steadily endeavor to bring about the change, there would be a fair chance of its success in the endeavor.

If the change could be made from the system of standing armies to that of a true militia of the Swiss type, a long step towards enduring peace would be made. In a military system of this nature the soldier and the citizen would be identical when put in the field; the men would take with them that quality of the household which makes the Swiss soldier an admirable home guard, but not to be considered for distant aggressive warfare. In such a condition the military motive in its dangerous form would speedily die out; all danger of its leading to wars of a political nature could be left to the ever-increasing development of the domestic spirit, that humor which makes men very willing to sacrifice for their ideals, but exceedingly indisposed to die for purposes which they do not value. If the armed forces of governments should be brought to the admirable state in which they are established in Switzerland, the discreet philanthropist might well be satisfied to go no further. In the existing conditions of society, and, for all we can foresee, in any highly organized society whatsoever, there will always be need of using well organized force to restrain the large part of the population who are willing to seek their ends by violence. There is no other way to retain the good which has been won, or to win that which is before us, save by the law, and the sanction of the law is in strength. It is a sense of this truth which goes far to justify the existence of the great standing armies in the minds of many judicious persons, who fail to see that a well organized militia can be made as effective in attaining the same valuable end.

The foregoing considerations serve to make it plain that this country is of all the great nations the best placed to undertake the noble task of clearing away the worst of all the evitable evils which remain to man at the close of the century. Owing to our singular geographical position and to the well-established traditions of our government, we are the first great nation which has been able to adopt a policy of non-interference with the affairs of other states. With the single lamentable exception of the Mexican war, where, as before noted, under the influence of motives which have passed away, we broke from our path, we have steadily avoided

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggressive wars. We have at the same time shown that a people thus withdrawn from the atmosphere of conflict can apply all needed power to the maintenance of its institutions and its ideals. With nothing to fear from abroad and with a well preserved indisposition to meddle with the problems of European politics, we are surely of all peoples the best fitted to undertake a movement to free the world from the evils of war. To those who desire to see the United States having a due influence in the affairs of the world, there is no other opportunity so good as this. Far better for our good name, or for the glory of that flag which only fools desire to see over battle fields, will be the enduring and blessed memory that our country led in a campaign against the monstrous evils of battle. We can afford to make the offer of a mode in which this work may be done: if by chance the tender of good-will should fail of evident result, we shall at least have acted in a spirit which is true to our history and to the best which is in our people; by the act we shall affirm our position to ourselves and to the rest of the world.

It should be said that the project for action outlined in the preceding pages, as that which might be taken by a permanent commission of arbitration, is presented simply to meet the natural objection that there is no evident method whereby such a body could deal with the problem of war. The suggestions cover only a part of the ground which might well be occupied by such a board, so that if certain of them should prove to skilled publicists and diplomats to be impracticable, there are others ready for consideration. The admirable example of the Alabama commission shows that questions which from their nature are the likeliest to lead to war may, if there be but the spirit of peace in the contestants, by wise counsellors be quietly adjusted. That adjustment shows us that the spirit of peace is active, that it needs but appropriate means to make its way. The means may be in our hands; it is our duty to try if this be so.

N. S. SHALER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW LONDON DEALS WITH BEGGARS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. LORD NORTON, PRESIDENT OF THE MENDICANCY SOCIETY.

THE treatment of mendicity by an old and highly civilized community, in a metropolis of enormous size and wealth, is an interesting and instructive subject of study.

The wise regulation of private charity, with an inevitable supplement of legal provision and police protection from fraud and depredation, has, in London, been the result of crucial experiments and trials of every kind.

The lesson may be of various application to other localities according to variety of circumstances, but it must be suggestive of wisdom to all. The problem is of difficult solution everywhere, and good and evil principles contend in embarrassing it. There are the promptings of instinctive charity, and the withholdings of selfish stint. There is a wise charity which strengthens the lame to walk, and the assuming patronage which teaches him to lean. The one gives great benefit with little thanks, the other loud thanks with little benefit.

English history illustrates every phase of this contention. Mendicancy was even a religious profession, till necessity gave mercy the discipline of law.

The true relation between beggars and relievers, or generally between want and means, requires painstaking discrimination.

It is the wildest of socialist theories that poverty should be abolished. So long as labor is the process of production, there must be a social scale from competence to beggary. The difference, no doubt, should be means of exercise of the mutual service of interdependence instead of isolation. This is misunderstood to be the language of proud patronage, but is really the inevitable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

postulate in every problem of society. The question will ever remain how best to deal with mendicancy.

In one sense all mankind are mendicant. Very few are simply making the best use of what they have for ultimate account. Most are seeking for something they have not. In fact, those who have enough and might spare for others are more than beggars. They are stealers. The chief offenders against the Eighth Commandment are those who "withhold more than is meet" of what is due from them to those who want.

But the beggars under this discussion are the criers of distress for the necessaries of life, whether the distress be feigned or true, whether self-caused, or from misfortune. Much of this mendicancy comes from mere preference of ease to labor. Much comes from a propensity to wild and wandering life, and repugnance to the restraints and obligations of society. Much is the revenge of vicious habits—*ultrices curæ*—which have incapacitated from power of self-support and industry.

Much is an organized imposture of simulated distress. But there is much, though less demonstrative, of a cry of real misfortune, and unavoidable want. The vicissitudes of industry and failure of employment, temporarily or even permanently incidental, accidents, sicknesses, bereavements, debilitating old age, and the stress of inevitable competition—all these, and other causes too, have, and will have, in every age and place, their victims crying for help.

In the great and wealthy community of London one might hope that only discrimination between the true and feigned cases of distress was wanted to meet their claims from private charity. But, alas, there are but few ready hands among the capable to help. It is said that only a few thousand names appear in repetition on all the various lists of metropolitan charities. But even the ready hands often may be too ready, and with careless bounty cause injury even to its receivers. It was a good old prayer which besought heaven to give wisdom to zeal, as well as zeal to wisdom. Sound principles of action, and painstaking care in the act are essential to useful and effective charity.

Unfortunately the claims coming from beggars of the first three kinds just specified, are the most urgent, and the most touching often, to sensitive feelings. The mendicants of idleness, wild life, and vice thrusting themselves on the support of charity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can only safely so be helped when hopeful of possibility of cure. Otherwise they require rather the correction of police, or must fall on the last resource of hopeless destitution, the public charge. The mendicants of professional imposture—the most ingenious and insidious interceptors of the relief due to poverty—are criminals of greatest danger to private morality and to the public welfare. To such simulators of distress, when detected, the severest punishment is the only due, in the interests not only of humanity but of justice. Such imposture has become a fine art in London. Not a benevolent scheme of any kind is ever started there, but the harpies of imposture fasten on it as fresh material for fraudulent gains. Professional "begging letter" writers, and the service of "valiant" importunity in the streets, and the manufacture of fictitious signs of suffering constitute a trade which draws a very lucrative income from deceived or intimidated charity. The beggars from real need have, in London, large provision of well regulated charities, checked and supplemented by a laboriously perfected poor law.

In Norman times the wayfarers were left to the charity and hospitality of religious houses. The poorer class were much provided for simply by their dependance on feudal relationship. The Monastic fraternities made mendicancy almost a sacred calling, some of them becoming mendicants themselves. But their wealth, though at one time calculated at a third of the whole country's, fell short of the increasing and self-developing demands. Advancing civilization exposed such modes of charity to great abuse and to depredation. The stirring of commerce, crusading enterprise, and civil commotion, diverted many from self-supporting industry to wild adventure. Multiplied rovers for prey throughout the country became the subjects of necessary legislative check. Many honest poor went unrelieved, and many whom misfortune disabled from work became objects for public provision.

Acts were passed to repress "vagabondage." Mendicancy was treated as an offence, for which whipping and even branding were assigned. Localities of "settlement" were made chargeable for the relief of actual destitution occurring within them. Justices were enjoined to carefully distinguish between unavoidable and voluntary impotence. For proper claimants the endowments of the Church and the benevolence of individuals were authoritatively called upon; and bishops were empowered to cite

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the Courts any "froward and wilful" refusers of weekly alms, which were made legally obligatory.

When the monasteries were suppresed the burden which they had borne was thrown on public provision. Poor laws were passed, and taxes levied on every parish, and overseers appointed to carry out the law.

The stringency of legal enactment provoked reactionary sentiment, and the administration of the poor law soon became relaxed. The relaxation, however, proved chiefly detrimental to the really poor, especially to those who were thrown temporarily into poverty from want of employment. Efforts at remedy by artificial modes of industry aggravated the mischief. Certain principles of relief were recovered from this experience. The Commission of Enquiry in 1834 produced the act which still rules the poor law system of England, added to, and in details amended, by a few supplementary enactments since.

The act of 1834 instituted a Central Department called the Poor Law Board for general supervision and inspection of all local administration. Parishes were grouped in unions with a common fund for common purposes.

A wider organization was so given to the treatment of mendicity. The law of local "settlement" was relaxed, and irremovability was increased, so facilitating and encouraging the range of industry and enabling workmen to avail themselves of the means of locomotion in search of employment.

This act set up workhouses for every Union of Parishes, restricting relief as much as possible to residence in such unattractive dwellings as a crucial test of destitution. Sentiment again revolted against the needful precautions of law, and it was proposed that the infirm might be relieved at home and that even the able-bodied should in some cases have out-door relief.

The principles of the act, however, have been in the main adhered to. Out-door relief is restricted to the utmost, and in some London Unions abolished altogether.

A separate act was passed for the metropolis providing for public asylums for the infirm, dispensaries, "casual wards" in the workhouses for vagrants, and schools for children of paupers.

The "Casual Wards" admit mendicants who escape all test of destitution. They present themselves for shelter at night, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in mercy must be admitted indoors. No question about out-door relief can apply to beggars who carry their homes on their backs. The only check on imposition by such applicants is the requirement of some work to be done by them on the following morning, before a meal is given them on their departure. Many schemes are now on foot for discriminating between wandering "tramps" living always on the road, without any occupation or destination, and men *bona fide* in search of work. What is called the "Ticket system" is thought the most promising device for this purpose. But the certificate of veracity, to be got at the first start, and shown at each place of application for shelter, partakes somewhat of the nature of the prescription for catching birds by putting salt on their tails. Some propose to give at departure from the ward not only a breakfast but a mid-day meal in the vagrant's pocket, if he has one, that it may be known at every wayside cottage that any begging, or threatening for food by such persons must be an imposture.

This subject, however, scarcely belongs to the treatment of beggars in London, which is only the focus not the scene, of vagrancy.

Poor laws are, after all, secondary, and properly supplemental, to the primary obligations of charity. They must also be rigidly bound by tests of destitution, while charity ranges freely without limit to its scope, and needs only wisdom to guide truly the freedom of its gifts. Poor law administers a trust fund for the public, but charity is responsible to God alone for the stewardship of His beneficence in discharge of an account with Him. The supplement of poor law is due to the negligence or deficiency of charity, or to cases of distress which charity cannot cure.

Private charity in secret, from acquaintances or relationship between rich and poor, takes the brightest share of the work—the godlike work—of love.

But charitable institutions give regulation and effect to the general work of charity on a wider scale for great communities. They abound in London. Their chief danger is their multiplication by individual efforts without concert on the wisest principles of action. Individualism is an English characteristic, and when any scheme of charity suggests itself to anyone's mind, it is generally a new and additional enterprise rather than incorporation with what is already in existence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their supporters are not numerous, and so dissipate their efficiency, yet not a houseless wanderer in London need ever fail to find a refuge, nor any kind of distress want appropriate relief. Homes, lodging-houses, infirmaries, dispensaries, hospitals of every kind, sisterhoods of mercy, asylums for the necessitous, and almost innumerable similar institutions, might seem exhaustive of all possible begging claims, and leaving little for the supplement of poor laws except so far as they are in partnership together.

Of associations for giving the best effect to the relief of the poor by private charity, two samples may suffice for illustration —one, the oldest now in operation, the other the latest result of practical experience in the idea of the completest possible co-operation.

The first, called "The London Mendicity," was very characteristically founded, soon after the peace of 1815, by the Duke of Wellington. He was pestered by innumerable beggers pretending to be discharged soldiers of his armies. Some of his old officers formed themselves into a committee to investigate these applications. In his diary there is an entry to this effect: "Was taken in by a plausible fellow whose repeated beggings on supposed events in his family I went on relieving, till some monstrous pretence showed it all to be a lie. What a wigging I shall get from the Mendicity." The society, so practically begun, has run for eighty years, and has carried on for a long list of subscribers, headed liberally by the Queen, the investigation of begging letters, so rescuing much private charity from imposture and mischief, and economizing the means of aid to real distress. Its officers have become well trained in detecting imposture and in delicately enquiring into cases of real distress. Idle vagrants are prosecuted by the society under acts for that purpose. Children hired out for begging are sent to industral schools. Police magistrates use the information of its officers and records in treating with beggars brought before them.

The voluntary Board of Management meet at its office twice a week, and report to subscribers the result of investigations of the applications sent them, or act as almoners themselves, giving relief up to a limit of amount allowed by the subscriber. They have also a "general relief fund" put at their disposal for applications made directly to them, and money—sometimes to a large amount—may be sent for special cases, to be laid out in larger

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

processes of gradual distribution, from casual misfortune, to renewed independence.

Tickets are given, for subscribers' cautious use, for small immediate relief to assist wretched beggars in the street, or, more safely, to refer them to the society's office, where, if on investigation real distress is proved, they are promised effective relief.

The latest and most comprehensive scheme of treatment of beggars in London has for its special object to give a definite aim to, and to direct into the most effectual channels, the large amount of benevolent force at work in England, and particularly in London.

The association consists of a federation of forty district committees, one in every poor law division of the metropolis, and of a central council, on which every committee is represented. Such an organization gives great means of collecting information, and of diffusing advice and influence throughout its operation. The combination of isolated efforts in uniform method and principles of action, the correction of much misplaced and wasted energy, the avoidance of conflicting action and the exposure of fraud, have been its proved most useful results. Its main principles are thorough investigation before assisting, and suitable and adequate assistance to proved cases of distress.

Its chief aim in giving assistance is the restoration of disablement to the power of self-help. Incurable helplessness it leaves to private care, or, that failing, to public provision.

Its detail of operation is much the same as that of the London Mendicity, with which society, among many others, it is in intimate co-operation.

In its committee are representatives of other charitable institutions, and many poor law guardians.

Its constables are enrolled with the Metropolitan Police, certified as mendicity officers by the Chief Commissioner, with power of apprehending beggars, making report to him. This society holds an annual conference, greatly contributing to uniform practice and mutual understanding. It maintains a visitation of those who have been assisted, and of some to whom material relief was not so much needed as friendly influence and guidance in ways of thrift and comfort unknown, or unsupplied, to them.

Half the wanderers begging help need but the inspiriting influence of friendly encouragement and healthy circumstance, which is due from higher quarters to the toilers in life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The cry of the beggars, true or false, will never cease; advancing civilization and wealth tend rather to increase it. The cry appeals to instinctive sympathy; and, whether true or false demands attention to ascertain the truth, and imperatively to prevent destitution. It is the primary duty of every man (says Sir Frederick Eden, in his celebrated "State of the Poor,") according to his ability, to relieve his fellow creatures in distress, by the dictates of humanity, and of Christianity, and for the political interests of the commonwealth in rescuing citizenship from incapacity. In the last of these two considerations Pericles asserted that there should be no poor in Athens. The *Civis Atheniensis* demanded state supply, and relegated labor to slaves.

Neither the rigid discipline of ancient Sparta, nor the independence of modern America could obliterate the stigma of craving want. The question is not how to stifle, or get rid of the beggar's cry, but how best to deal with it.

To find employment for the unemployed, or to legislate sufficient wages are schemes which experience has exploded. To defy economic laws, and argue that they should not be, is only to paralyze exertion, and staunch the capital which might sustain it.

The beggar's cry represents God's own demand for men's mutual service. The first claim it makes is on private charity, and those who withhold any means they have to meet it will find a Nemesis in ultimate account when present beggars will be begged by them for a drop or water, and when those who had pity will be repaid a thousand fold.

The default of charity is the province of legal relief. London has perfected the union of charity with law. But the study of preventives of the beggar's cry is even more important than of its cure. The spirit of self-help must not be checked but in every way encouraged, for all distress that is not incurable. Friendly societies, the soon developing trades unions, co-operative stores, and savings banks represent that spirit. There are also the national provisions of education, and emigration to the world-wide offers of this Empire to industry and wealth.

London shows districts of former squalor, and despondency, in which the poor, without removal, have found fresh energy and means of life, by merely cleansed and healthier dwellings.

NORTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESULTS OF THE BERING SEA ARBITRATION.

BY THE HON. JOHN W. FOSTER, EX-SECRETARY OF STATE.

THE United States stand distinguised among the nations as the foremost champion of international arbitration. Our ablest and wisest statesmen have recognized it as the best way of adjusting most questions of difference arising between governments, when the ordinary diplomatic methods fail. Such being the settled policy of the country, it would be unfortunate for the cause of peace and civilization in the world if that policy should be prejudiced in the United States for want of correct information or through partisan bias.

One of the last arbitrations in which the United States participated was that held at Paris in 1893 for the settlement of the questions which had arisen with Great Britain respecting the fur seals of the Pribylov Islands in Bering Sea; and the impression seems to prevail with many of our people that this arbitration was unwisely entered upon, that it was fruitless in its results to us, and that the responsibility for the failure is chargeable to the administration which agreed to it. Every one of these conclusions is incorrect, and, in the interest of the great cause of international arbitration, their fallacy should be exposed. It seems the more opportune at this time, as the subject is likely to be presented anew to Congress at its approaching session.

It is well, in the first place, to examine the origin of the controversy. Alaska was ceded by Russia to the United States in 1867, and in 1870 the Seal Islands in Bering Sea were leased by the government to a private company, with the privilege of taking on the land a certain number of seals annually. Soon thereafter it became apparent that the seal herd was exposed to serious diminution by means of pelagic or open sea hunting. As early as 1872 the attention of the government was called to this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

danger, and it was suggested that a revenue cutter be sent to cruise in the vicinity of the passes of the Aleutian chain, through which the herd travelled on its way to and from the Seal Islands, with a view to preventing such hunting. But Mr. Boutwell, Secretary of the Treasury, declined to act upon the suggestion, stating: "I do not see that the United States would have the jurisdiction or power to drive off parties going up there for that purpose, unless they made the attempt within a marine league of the shore." With the progress of time pelagic hunting increased along the Canadian and American coasts, with greater slaughter of the herd, and with occasional incursions into Bering Sea. There was gradually developed a contention that the principle laid down by Secretary Boutwell did not apply to Bering Sea, because Russia had claimed and enforced exclusive jurisdiction over all its waters, that it had been acquiesced in by the maritime nations, including Great Britain, and that all the rights of Russia therein passed to the United States by the cession. The act of Congress of 1868 (Section 1956) made it unlawful to kill seals "within the limits of Alaska Territory or *in the waters thereof*," and it was claimed that the waters of Alaska embraced all that portion of Bering Sea east of the line designated in the Russian treaty of cession. Under the foregoing construction of the treaty and the statute, the first seizure of British vessels in Bering Sea took place under instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury by the Revenue vessels in 1886, and other seizures followed in 1887. Suits were instituted in the Federal Court at Sitka under the Act cited and the vessels were condemned. The judge, whose tenure of office under the practice in vogue as to that Territory was limited to the political administration which appointed him, following the line of argument submitted by the District Attorney in a brief prepared in the office of the Attorney-General, held that "all the waters within the boundary set forth in the treaty . . . are to be considered as comprised within the waters of Alaska, and all the penalties prescribed by law . . . must therefore attach within those limits." He further held that "as a matter of international law, it makes no difference that the accused parties may be subjects of Great Britain. Russia had claimed and exercised jurisdiction over all that portion of Bering Sea . . . and that claim had been tacitly recognized and acquiesced in by the other maritime powers of the world."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The seizure and condemnation of the British vessels were followed by an attempt to secure a more precise and strict definition of "*the waters of Alaska*" by Congressional legislation. A lengthy investigation was had by a Committee of the House of Representatives in 1888; and in January, 1889, a report was made by Mr. Dunn, of Arkansas, chairman of the Committee, fully sustaining the view taken by the Attorney-General and the Federal Judge in Alaska, and submitting a bill which declared "that Section 1956 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was intended to include and apply to, and is hereby declared to include and apply to, *all waters of Bering Sea* in Alaska embraced within the boundary lines" of the treaty with Russia. This bill was passed by the House, but in the Senate it was sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that Committee recommended that the clause above quoted be disagreed to; and the chairman, Mr. Sherman, in support of the recommendation, stated that the proposed legislation "involved serious matters of international law . . . and ought to be disagreed to and abandoned, and considered more carefully hereafter." Subsequently, by virtue of a conference report, an act was passed declaring Section 1956 to include and apply "to *all the dominion* of the United States in the waters of Bering Sea."

The seizure and condemnation of vessels as stated constitute the origin and foundation of the complaint of the British Government and of the lengthy correspondence and negotiations which resulted in the arbitration at Paris. These seizures were the act of the administration of President Cleveland, and had the indorsement of the executive, politico-judicial and legislative departments of that administration. In so far as the views of the opposing political party may be inferred from the attitude of Secretary Boutwell and Senator Sherman, they were against the legality or wisdom of the policy.

The complaint of Great Britain in 1887 was followed by a diplomatic correspondence, in which Secretary Bayard, without discussing or yielding the grounds upon which the seizures had been made, proposed an international arrangement for the protection of the seals from extermination. With this proposition pending and with all the questions arising out of the seizures unsettled, the executive government of the United States passed into the hands of President Harrison. Mr. Blaine, on assuming the duties

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Secretary of State, sought to carry into effect the proposition of his predecessor for an international agreement. He found that few of the governments approached had shown any interest in the proposition, but early in the administration he pressed the subject upon the attention of Great Britain, and as soon as possible secured a joint conference at Washington with the British and Russian Ministers. After prolonged interviews the conference proved a failure, as Great Britain was unwilling to enter into any international arrangement which the two other interested powers felt was at all adequate to protect the seals from extermination.

The measure which Secretary Bayard had initiated for the settlement of the questions arising out of the seizure of British vessels having proved impossible of realization, there seemed no other alternative but to defend the action of the previous administration; and thereupon followed the notable diplomatic correspondence between Mr. Blaine and Lord Salisbury, in which the former sought with all his recognized forensic skill to defend the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in ordering the seizures and, as far as he felt it possible to do so, to sustain the correctness in international law of the attitude of the Attorney-General and the Judge of the Federal Court of Alaska. In no part of that statesman's career did his devotion to his country more conspicuously rise above partisanship than in that correspondence. It is doubtful if any other living American could have made a more brilliant or effective defence of the action of his government, and whatever fallacies exist in his argument are chargeable to the previous administration which had occasioned the controversy and marked out the line of defence.

The correspondence showed the two governments in hopeless disagreement. Three courses were open to President Harrison, and one of them must be chosen without further delay. First: He could abandon the claim of exclusive jurisdiction over Bering Sea or protection of the seals beyond the three mile limit, recede from the action of his predecessor as to seizure of British vessels and pay the damages claimed therefor. Such a course would have met with the general disapproval of the nation, and would have been denounced by his political opponents as a base betrayal of the country's interests. Second: He could have rejected the arguments and protests of the British Government, and continued the policy initiated by his predecessor in the seizure

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of all British vessels engaged in pelagic sealing in Bering Sea. But this course had already been proposed to President Cleveland and decided to be improper. The Hon. E. J. Phelps, who as Minister to Great Britain had conducted the negotiations with Lord Salisbury growing out of the seizures of 1886 and 1887, in a lengthy dispatch to Secretary Bayard, reviewing the conduct of Canada which had prevented an adjustment once accepted by Lord Salisbury, made the following recommendation: "Under these circumstances, the Government of the United States must, in my opinion, either submit to have these valuable fisheries destroyed or must take measures to prevent their destruction by capturing the vessels employed in it. Between these two alternatives it does not appear to me there should be the slightest hesitation. . . . I earnestly recommend, therefore, that the vessels that have been seized while engaged in this business be firmly held, and that measures be taken to capture and hold every one hereafter found concerned in it. . . . There need be no fear that a resolute stand on this subject will at once put an end to the mischief complained of." But this recommendation of Mr. Phelps was not approved by Mr. Bayard, who was unwilling to adopt a course which might bring about a rupture with Great Britain, the probable outcome of which would have been an armed conflict. In view of this decision and the state of public sentiment, with a prevailing opinion in a large part of the press and with public men that the attitude of the government was legally unsound, and that the interests involved did not under the circumstances stated justify the hazard of a great war between these two English-speaking nations, the adoption of this second alternative by President Harrison would have been the height of madness. The only remaining alternative was arbitration. President Harrison felt that if we could commit to an international tribunal the far greater interests and principles involved in the Alabama Claims, it would be the part of wisdom to adopt the same course as to the pending questions of difference, and there can be no doubt that the sober judgment of the country confirms his action.

If, therefore, the Paris arbitration was unwise in any of its features it must have been in the manner of submission of the questions to the Tribunal. But in this respect, also, the conduct of President Harrison was greatly restricted by the action of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

predecessor. He was required to formulate for the decision of the Tribunal the contentions upon which the seizures were made, and the first four points embraced in article VI. of the treaty will be found to accurately cover the grounds upon which the Attorney-General in 1887 asked for, and the Federal Judge based, the condemnation of the British vessels. It is a singular incident that when the case of the United States came to be prepared and the Russian archives were examined, what had been assumed in the legal proceedings to be historical facts could scarcely be substantiated by a single official document. It is also notable that the only additional question introduced in the treaty provision for submission to the Tribunal—that embraced in the fifth point, to wit, the right of protection or property in the seals, and which in the judgment of the counsel of the United States became the leading, if not the only, defence of the seizures—was not advanced in the legal proceedings of 1887, and was not mooted until a late stage of Mr. Blaine's controversy with Lord Salisbury. The chief credit for the development of this point is due to Mr. Tracy, Secretary of the Navy, who submitted a paper of rare legal ability on the subject to the President, which at a later date appeared in this REVIEW.* The treaty after having undergone the careful scrutiny of the President and Hon. E. J. Phelps, whose advice had been sought by the President, was submitted to the Senate and approved by that body without a single dissenting voice, so far as known. If the conduct of the President, in the management of the controversy created by his predecessor, had not been in the judgment of the country wise and patriotic, or if the provisions of the treaty had not been properly framed, it would scarcely have escaped the attention of his political opponents in the Senate.

Hence, the only remaining criticism which might be advanced against the arbitration must relate to the management of the case before the Tribunal. But in this respect also it must be recognized that the President's action was circumspect and free from all partisanship. In naming the arbitrators on the part of the United States, he chose, with the cordial approval of the Chief Justice and his associates, Mr. Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court, as senior American member of the Tribunal. In filling the second place he selected Senator Morgan, the recognized

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, May, 1893.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leader on all international questions in the Senate of the party whose officials had originated the subject matter of arbitration. Hon. E. J. Phelps, President Cleveland's Minister in London, an experienced diplomatist and a lawyer of national repute, had been consulted by the President several months before the treaty had been agreed upon, and when the case came to be prepared he was named as senior counsel. With him was associated James C. Carter, of New York, the recognized leader of the American bar; and before the tribunal was organized Frederick R. Coudert, an accomplished French scholar and a prominent jurist, was added to the list. These three gentlemen were the political friends of Mr. Cleveland. With them was joined a single party friend of President Harrison, H. W. Blodgett, for many years a distinguished judge of the Federal Court. Senator Morgan in a recent letter says: "Our party was and is responsible for using the means that were employed both for the raising and the settlement of these questions, and it was a just measure of responsibility that Mr. Harrison devolved upon us when, out of a body of arbitrators and counsel and Mr. Secretary Foster, the Agent, selected by him—seven in all—he selected four Democrats and three Republicans." As to the manner in which these gentlemen discharged their trust we have the following testimony of Mr. Justice Harlan, in a public address: "I may say that no government was ever represented upon any occasion where its interests were involved with more fidelity, with more industry and with greater ability than was the United States by its agent and counsel. . . . If more was not obtained it was solely because a majority of that tribunal . . . did not see their way to grant more."

On five points submitted to the Tribunal, embracing the historical and legal questions, the decision was unfavorable to the United States. While the action of the government in making the seizures was based on the weakest ground of our defence and which proved untenable, it cannot be doubted that the motives which actuated its conduct were patriotic and praiseworthy. But had our effort to save the seals from destruction been from the outset based upon a right of protection and property in them, our case before the Tribunal would have been much stronger and the decision might have been different. Nevertheless, it cannot be justly claimed that the arbitration was fruitless in its results

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for us. It is no small matter that a question which threatened a rupture of our peaceful relations with Great Britain was adjusted by a resort to the arbitrament of reason and not of force. The Alaskan seal herd is of great value to us and to the world, and it is the duty of our government to be vigilant in protecting it from destruction; but the legal issues involved in our controversy with Great Britain regarding them did not seem to justify the hazard of an armed conflict, and it was a great gain to us that the controversy was peacefully settled without national dishonor.

The decision of the Tribunal was adverse to the United States on the legal points in dispute, but the award contained an important provision for international regulations, which were intended by the Tribunal to be a protection to the seals and which in the judgment of the majority of that body would in practice prove an adequate protection. The agent and counsel of the United States contended that no regulations would be a certain protection of the herd which did not prohibit all pelagic sealing, and the American arbitrators voted for such prohibition, and sustained their votes by very able and cogent opinions; but the majority of the Tribunal took a different view of the subject. The regulations adopted were opposed both by the American and Canadian arbitrators. When first published they were accepted by all the Americans who participated in the arbitration as a decided triumph for the United States, and were regarded by the Canadian sealers as a serious menace, if not a death-blow, to their interests. If they are carefully examined they will be found to be more favorable to the United States than the regulations which Mr. Bayard proposed to Lord Salisbury as a settlement of the question, or which Mr. Blaine offered to Sir Julian Pauncefote. If, therefore, we obtained more from the Tribunal than our government proposed to accept from Great Britain, the arbitration cannot justly be characterized as fruitless in its results for us. The adequacy of the regulations cannot be properly judged, because they have not yet been put in force in their true spirit and intent. This will not be done until they are also made to apply to the Russian waters, and until more stringent rules for their enforcement are adopted. It has been a source of disappointment to many who have taken an interest in the preservation of the seals that these rules have been so lax and so imperfectly observed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The obstruction in these respects is now, as it has been from the beginning, the selfish and inhuman conduct of Canada.

The purpose of this article, to wit, the defence of the policy of international arbitration, has been accomplished; as it has been shown by the foregoing review that the Paris arbitration was not unwisely entered upon, that it was not altogether fruitless in its results for us, and that the administration which agreed to it cannot be held culpable for the manner of its submission or management. But it will naturally be expected that something be said concerning the question of damages, a subject which was not settled by the award. In article VIII. of the Treaty it was expressly stipulated that "the question of liability of each for the injuries alleged to have been sustained by the other" should not be embraced in the arbitration, but should "be the subject of future negotiation." In the discussion following the adjournment of the Tribunal, the fact seems to have been lost sight of that the United States preferred serious claims for damages against Great Britain on account of the injuries done by British pelagic sealers to the Alaskan seal herd, and that President Harrison proposed that this question of damages should, together with the British claims for seizure of vessels, be submitted to the Tribunal. It was because Great Britain refused to consent to arbitrate this claim that the whole subject was omitted. The award of the Tribunal was in effect that in certain waters, and at certain times, pelagic sealing is improper and should not be permitted. How far the claim of the United States subsists for injuries in the past sustained by the seal herd in those times and waters is one of the questions to be determined by the "future negotiations" contemplated in the Treaty; and prominent persons well informed as to the controversy contend that it is still a vital question.

While the liability for damages was not within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, it is generally admitted that the effect of its decision was to fix upon the United States a certain measure of responsibility for damages on account of the seizures, which would have to be met through the "future negotiations." Without further investigation than the documentary evidence before the Paris Tribunal, the sum of $425,000 was agreed upon between the Secretary of State and the British Ambassador as a full satisfaction of the claims for the seizure of the British vessels, and the Congress of the United States was asked to make an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appropriation for that purpose. In the discussion which arose in the House of Representatives when the subject came before that body it was most unfortunate that it should have assumed a partisan aspect. When certain members argued that the sum asked for was greatly in excess of the just and legal claims of the Canadian sealers, and that it was in direct conflict with the views of the Agent and Counsel of the United States before the Tribunal, they were taunted with the charge that this obligation had been contracted by the administration of which they were supporters. The member of the Committee on Appropriations who had the measure in charge said: "This is not our foreign policy. We are paying a debt which you gentlemen gave us." Mr. McCreary, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in advocacy of the appropriation, used this language: "I regret that we have been placed in an attitude where we have to pay this amount; but the gentlemen on the other side of this House cannot claim that we caused the existing situation." How unwarranted were these assertions is shown in the foregoing review.

It may have been the wisest policy to vote the appropriation, but it was no breach of our international obligations not to approve of that sum; and it is not to the discredit of Congress that it exercised its judgment as to the action of the executive in agreeing to a settlement with Great Britain which altogether ignored the claim of the United States for damages to the seals by improper pelagic hunting, and the views of its own representatives before the Tribunal as to the British claims. While a difference of views may properly exist between the executive and legislative departments upon these subordinate questions, no disposition has been entertained or shown by any portion of our government or people to evade our just obligations under the Treaty. And the fact that the spirit of the award leads us to pay out of the national treasury a sum by way of damages, which at the most must be regarded as insignificant for a great nation, should certainly have no tendency to modify in the slightest degree our devotion to the great policy of international arbitration.

JOHN W. FOSTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHRISTIANITY'S MILLSTONE.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D.

At the recent English Church Congress held at Norwich, Professor Bonney, Canon of Manchester, made a bold and honorable attempt to cast a millstone off the neck of Christianity by frankly renouncing belief in the historical character of the earlier books of the Bible.

"I cannot deny," he said, "that the increase of scientific knowledge has deprived parts of the earlier books of the Bible of the historical value which was generally attributed to them by our forefathers. The story of the creation in Genesis, unless we play fast and loose either with words or with science, cannot be brought into harmony with what we have learned from geology. Its ethnological statements are imperfect, if not sometimes inaccurate. The stories of the flood and of the Tower of Babel are incredible in their present form. Some historical element may underlie many of the traditions in the first eleven chapters of that book, but this we cannot hope to recover."

With the historical character of the chapters relating to the creation, Canon Bonney must resign his belief in the Fall of Adam; with his belief in the Fall of Adam he must surrender the doctrine of the Atonement, as connected with that event, and thus relieve conscience of the strain put upon it in struggling to reconcile Vicarious Punishment with our sense of justice. He will also have to lay aside his belief in the Serpent of the Temptation, and in the primeval personality of evil.

In *Lux Mundi*, a collection of essays edited by the Reverend Principal of Pusey House, and understood to emanate from the High Church quarter, we find plain indications that the unhistoric character, so frankly recognized by the learned Canon in the opening chapters of Genesis, is recognized in other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parts of Old Testament history by High Churchmen, who, having studied recent criticism, feel, like the Canon, that there is a millstone to be cast off. One of these essayists admits that the "battle of historical record cannot be fought on the field of the Old Testament as it can on that of the New"; that "very little of the early record can be securely traced to a period near the events"; and that "the Church cannot insist upon the historical character of the earliest records of the ancient church in detail as she can on the historical character of the Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles." The same writer seems ready to entertain the view that the "books of Chronicles represent a later and less historical version of Israel's history than that given in Samuel and Kings," and that they "represent the version of that history which had become current in the priestly schools." "Conscious perversion" he will not acknowledge, but in the theory of "unconscious idealizing" of history he is willing, apparently, to acquiesce. Inspiration, he thinks, is consistent with this sort of "idealizing," though it excludes conscious deception or pious fraud. Conscious deception or pious fraud no large minded and instructed critic of primeval records would be inclined to charge. But "ideal" is apparently only another name for "mythical," and it is difficult to see how myths can in any sense be inspired, or why, if the records are in any sense inspired, the Church should not be able to insist on their historical character. "In detail" is a saving expression; but the details make up the history, and if the truth of the details cannot be guaranteed, what is our guarantee for the truth of the whole? Human testimony, no doubt, may sometimes fail in minor particulars, while in the main account of the matter it is true. But is it conceivable that the Holy Spirit, in dictating the record of God's dealings with mankind for our instruction in the way of life, should simulate the defects of human evidence?

A veil which has long hung before the eyes of free inquiry when they were turned on the origin and state of man is removed by the Canon's renunciations. The present writer, as a student at college, attended the lectures of Dr. Buckland, a pioneer in geology; and he remembers the desperate shifts to which the lecturer was driven in his efforts to reconcile the facts of his science with the Mosaic cosmogony, the literal truth of which he did not venture to impugn. By a "day," Dr. Buckland said,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moses meant a geological period, though the text says that each day was made up of a morning and an evening, while the Decalogue fixes the sense by enjoining the observance of the seventh day as that on which the Creator rested after the six days' labor of creation. How the professor dealt with fossil records of geological races and the appearance of death in the world before the fall of man, the writer does not now remember. It is not very long since a preacher before an educated audience could meet the objection to the Mosaic deluge arising from the position of stones in the mountains of Auvergne, which such a cataclysm must have swept away, by the simple expedient of affirming that when the deluge was over, the stones had been restored to their places by miracle. Nay, were not Mr. Gladstone's great intellectual powers the other day exerted to prove that the Creator, in dictating to Moses the account of the creation, had come wonderfully near the scientific truth and almost anticipated the nebular hypothesis ?

From the conceptions of science, geocentricism, derived from the Mosaic cosmogony, may have been banished, but over those of theology its cloud still heavily hangs. The consecrated impression has survived the distinct belief, and faith shrinks from the theological revolution which the abandonment of the impression would involve.

The history of every nation begins with myth. A primeval tribe keeps no record, and a nation in its maturity has no more recollection of what happened in its infancy than a man of what happened to him in his cradle. It is needless to say that the first book of Livy is a tissue of fable, though the Romans were great keepers of records and matter-of-fact as a people. When the age of reflection arrives and the nation begins to speculate on its origin, it gives itself a mythical founder, a Theseus, a Romulus, or an Abraham, and ascribes to him its ancestral institutions or customs. In his history also are found the keys to immemorial names and the origin of mysterious or venerated objects. It is a rule of criticism that we cannot by any critical alembic extract materials for history out of fable. If the details of a story are fabulous, so is the whole. If the details of Abraham's story—the appearances of the Deity to him, so strangely anthropomorphic, the miraculous birth of his son when his wife was ninety years old, his adventures with Sarah in Egypt and afterwards in Gerar,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evidently two versions of the same legend, the sacrifice of his son arrested by the angel, with the episode of Lot, the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, and the turning of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt—are plainly unhistorical, the whole story must be relegated to the domain of tribal fancy. We cannot make a real personage out of unrealities or fix a place for him in unrecorded time.

That the alleged record is of a date posterior by many centuries to the events, and therefore no record at all, plainly appears from the mention of Kings of Israel in Genesis (xxxvi., 31). No reason has been shown for supposing that the passage is an interpolation, while the suggestion that it is prophetic is extravagant. It stamps the date of the book, like the mention of the death of Moses in Deuteronomy, to get rid of which efforts equally desperate are made. The canon of Sir George Cornewall Lewis, limiting the trustworthiness of oral tradition to a single century, may be too rigid; but we certainly cannot trust oral tradition for such a period as that between the call of Abraham and the Kings, especially when, the alleged events being miraculous, an extraordinary amount of evidence is necessary to justify belief.

The figure of the patriarch Abraham, a typical sheikh, as well as the father of Israel, is exceptionally vivid, and his history is exceptionally dramatic. It is needless to say that the history contains episodes of striking beauty, such as the meeting of the steward with Rebekah, the scene of Hagar and her child nearly perishing in the wilderness, and the sacrifice of Isaac. But to regard Abraham as a real founder, not only of a nation, but of the Church, and as the chosen medium of communication between God and man, sound criticism will no longer allow us; and sound criticism, like genuine science, is the voice of the Spirit of Truth. A writer in *Lux Mundi*, already quoted, avows his belief that "the modern development of historical criticism is reaching results as sure, where it is fairly used, as scientific inquiry." He significantly reminds churchmen of the warning conveyed by the name of Galileo. Why should we any longer cling to that which, whatever it may have been to the men of a primeval tribe, is to us a low and narrow conception of the Deity? Why should we force ourselves to believe that the Being who fills eternity and infinity became the guest of a Hebrew sheikh; entered into a covenant with the sheikh's tribe, to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exclusion of the rest of the human race; and as the seal of the covenant ordained the perpetuation of a barbarous tribal rite? There have been bibliolaters so extreme as to wish even converted Jews to continue the practice to which the promise was mysteriously annexed. Tribalism may attach inordinate value to genealogies as well as to ancestral rites, but can we imagine the author of the universe limiting his providential regard and his communication of vital truth to his creatures by tribal lines? Every tribe is the chosen people of its own god; enjoys a monopoly of his favor; is upheld by him against the interest of other nations, and especiall protected by him in war. It is he who gives it victory, and if stones fall or are hurled on the enemy retreating through a rocky pass, it is he who casts them down (Joshua x., 11). Christianity is the denial of Jewish tribalism, proclaiming that all nations have been made of one blood to dwell together on the earth, and are sharers alike in the care of Providence. Of the bad effects of a conception of God drawn from the conceptions of Jewish tribalism, the least is the waste of money and effort in desperate attempts to convert the Jews.

Of the history of the other Patriarchs the texture is apparently the same as that of the history of Abraham. They are mythical founders of a race, a character which extends to Ishmael and Esau. In fact the chapters relating to them are full of what, in an ordinary case, would be called ethnological myth. Of contemporary or anything like contemporary record, even supposing the Pentateuch to have been written by Moses, there can be no pretence. Thus it is in the absence of anything like evidence that we have been called upon to accept such incidents as the bodily wrestling of Jehovah with Jacob, and the appearance to Jacob in a dream of an angel who is the organ of a supernatural communication about the speckles of the rams or he-goats. Most vivid and memorable, no doubt, are the characters of Esau, the typical father of the hunter tribe, and that of Jacob in whose unscrupulous and successful cunning we have a picture such as the anti-Semite would now draw of his enemy, the financial Jew. These chapters are full of legends connected with fanciful interpretations of names, such as Jehovah-Jireh (Genesis xxii., 14); fanciful accounts of immemorial monuments, such as Jacob's pillar; or of tribal customs, such as that of refraining from a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

particular sinew because it had been touched and made to shrink by Jehovah in wrestling with Jacob. Extraordinary simplicity is surely displayed by the pious commentators who appeal to the custom as evidence of the historic event.

Much labor has been spent in efforts to identify the Pharaoh of the Exodus and to fix the date of that event and its connection with Egyptian history. Still more labor has been spent in tracing the route of the Israelites through the wilderness and explaining away the tremendous difficulties of the narrative. What if the whole is mythical? There is a famine in Palestine. The Patriarch sends his ten sons, each with an ass and a sack, across the desert to buy food in Egypt. Provisions must have been furnished them for their journey, and of what they bought they must have consumed not a little on their journey home. This seems improbable, nor was it very likely that the ten should strike the exact place where their brother Joseph was in power. Of the poetic character of the story of Joseph, with its miraculous dreams and their interpretations, there surely can be no doubt. Yet upon the story of Joseph and his brethren all the rest apparently hangs. We might almost renounce the task of analysing the rest of the narrative—the attempt of the Egyptian rulers to extirpate the Hebrews by the strange command to the midwives when they might have taken a shorter and surer course; the contest in thaumaturgy between the magicians of Jehovah and those of Egypt; the plagues sent upon the helpless people of Egypt to make their ruler do that which Omnipotence might at once have done by its fiat; the extraordinary multiplication of the Hebrews, whose adult males, in spite of the destruction of their male children, amount to six hundred thousand, a number which implies a total population of at least two millions; their sudden appearance as an armed host though they had just been represented as the unresisting bondsmen of the Egyptians; their wanderings for forty years within the narrow limits of the Sinaitic peninsula, where, though the region is desert, they find subsistence not only for themselves but for their innumerable flocks and herds; their construction of a tabernacle where materials for it could not have been found; the plague of fiery serpents which was sent among them and the brazen serpent by looking on which they were healed; the miraculous destruction of the impious opponents of an exclusive priesthood; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

giants of Canaan; the victories gained over native tribes by the direct interposition of Heaven; the strange episode of Balaam and his colloquy with his ass; the stopping of the sun and moon that Israel might have time for the pursuit and slaughter of his enemies. This last incident alone seems enough to stamp the legendary character of the whole. In vain we attempt to reduce the miracle, which would imply a disturbance of the entire solar system, to a mere prolongation of the daylight. The Old Testament is altogether geocentric, and not merely in the phenomenal sense. The sun and moon are made "for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light on the earth," and with them is coupled the creation of the stars. The writer of the book of Joshua cites the book of Jasher as evidence of the miracle. Was the book of Jasher inspired? Could an inspired writer need or rest on the evidence of one who was uninspired?

Whether any sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt or any real connection with that country is denoted by the visit of Abraham to Egypt and afterwards by the story of the Exodus, it is for Egyptologists to determine. Of the appearance of Hebrew forms on Egyptian monuments, Egyptian conquest would appear to give a sufficient explanation. The history of the Exodus is connected with the account of the institution of the Passover, and analogy may lead us to surmise that national imagination has been busy in explaining the origin of an immemorial rite.

We are, then, in no way bound to believe that God so identified himself with a favored tribe as to license it to invade a number of other tribes which had done it no wrong, to slaughter them and take possession of their land. We are in no way bound to believe that he, by the mouth of Moses, rebuked his chosen people for saving alive the women and children of the Midianites and bade them kill every male among the little ones and every woman that had known man (Numbers xxxi., 17); or that he commanded them to slay, not only man, woman, and child, but the dumb animals, everything that breathed, in a captured city. To the objections raised by humanity against the slaughter of the Canaanites, Christian apologists have made various and, as one of their number admits, not very consistent replies. Some say that in conquering Canaan the Israelites did but recover their own, a plea which, even if it had not been ousted by prescription, would be totally inconsistent with the account of the sojourning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Abraham and of his purchase of plots of land. Others maintain that, having been driven by force from Egypt, they had a right to help themselves to a home where they could find it, and to put all the existing inhabitants to the sword. The bequest of Noah is also pleaded. But at last the apologist has to fall back upon the simple command of God, which is justified on the ground that the Canaanites were idolaters, they never having heard of the true God.

Such examples as the slaughter of the Canaanites, the killing of Sisera, the assassination of Eglon, the hewing of Agag in pieces by Samuel before the Lord, Elijah's massacre of the prophets of Baal, the hanging of Haman with his ten sons, commemorated in the hideous feast of Purim, have, it is needless to say, had a deplorable effect in forming the harsher and darker parts of the character which calls itself Christian. They are responsible in no small degree for murderous persecutions, and for the extirpation or oppression of heathen races. The dark side of the Puritan character in particular is traceable to their influence. Macaulay mentions a fanatical Scotch Calvinist whose writings, he says, hardly bear a trace of acquaintance with the New Testament.

Jael, when she decoyed her husband's ally into her tent and slew him while he was resting trustfully beneath it, broke in the most signal manner the sacred rule of Arab hospitality, as well as the ordinary moral law. The comment of orthodoxy upon this is: "If we can overlook the treachery and violence which belong to the age and country, and bear in mind Jael's ardent sympathies with the oppressed people of God, her faith in the right of Israel to possess the land in which they were now slaves, her zeal for the glory of Jehovah as against the gods of Canaan, and the heroic courage and firmness with which she executed her deadly purpose, we shall be ready to yield to her the praise which is her due."* The extenuating motives supplied by the commentator are not to be found in the text. To reconcile us to the assassination of Eglon, a distinction is drawn between God's providential order and his moral law, the providential order ordaining what the moral law would forbid.

The writer heard the other day a very beautiful Christian sermon on the purity of heart in virtue of which good men see God. But the lesson of the day, read before that sermon, was

* The Speaker's Commentary, *ad loc.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the history of Jehu. Jehu, a usurper, begins by murdering Joram, the son of his master Ahab, King of Israel, and Ahaziah, the King of Judah, neither of whom had done him any wrong. He then has Jezebel, Ahab's widow, killed by her own servants. Next he suborns the guardians and tutors of Ahab's seventy sons in Samaria to murder the children committed to their care and send the seventy heads to him in baskets to be piled at the gate of the city. Then he butchers the brethren of Ahaziah, King of Judah, with whom he falls in on the road, two-and-forty in number, for no specified or apparent crime. On his arrival at Samaria there is more butchery. Finally he entraps all the worshippers of Baal, by an invitation to a solemn assembly, and massacres them to a man. At the end of this series of atrocities the Lord is made to say to him, "Because thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes and hast done unto the house of Ahab all that was in my heart, thy children unto the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel."

David is loyal, chivalrous, ardent in friendship, and combines with adventurous valor the tenderness which has led to our accepting him as the writer of some of the Psalms. So far, he is an object of our admiration, due allowance for time and circumstance being made. But he is guilty of murder and adultery, both in the first degree; he puts to death with hideous tortures the people of a captured city; on his death-bed he bequeaths to his son a murderous legacy of vengeance; he exemplifies by his treatment of his ten concubines, whom he shuts up for life, the most cruel evils of polygamy (2 Samuel, xx., 3). The man after God's own heart he might be deemed by a primitive priesthood to whose divinity he was always true; but it is hardly possible that he should be so deemed by a moral civilization. Still less possible is it that we should imagine the issues of spiritual life to be so shut up that from this man's loins salvation would be bound to spring.

The books of the Old Testament, and notably the historical books, are for the most part by unknown authors and of unknown dates. Nor do they put forward themselves any claim to inspiration. Where they cite elder authorities, such as the book of Jasher, they in effect declare themselves indebted to human records, and therefore uninspired. Preachers, especially preachers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of reform, speak in the name of Heaven. Oriental and primitive preachers speak as the inspired organs of Heaven. The Prophets, whose name, with its modern connotation, is scarcely more appropriate than it would be if applied to Savonarola or John Wesley, are in this respect like others of their class. One of them when bidden to prophesy calls for a minstrel, under the influence of whose strains the hand of the Lord comes upon him (2 Kings, iii., 15; see also 1 Samuel, x., 5). All seers, as their name imports, have visions. Primitive lawgivers speak by divine command. In no other way, apparently, is inspiration claimed by the authors of the Old Testament.

Jesus came to substitute a religion of conscience for that of law, a religion of humanity for that of the tribe, worship in spirit and in truth for worship in the Temple. His preaching was a reaction against the Judaism then impersonated in the Pharisee, afterwards developed in the Talmud, and now fully represented in the Talmudic Jew. But he was not a revolutionist. Like Socrates, he accepted established institutions, including the national ritual, and in that sense fulfilled all righteousness. He accepted the sacred books among the rest, and in addressing an audience which believed in them, he cited them and appealed to their authority in the usual way. He cites the book of Jonah, and in terms which seem to show that he regards it as a real history; so that a literalist, like the late Dr. Liddon, took fire at being told that the book was an apologue, considering this an impeachment of the veracity of Jesus. Yet few, even of the most orthodox, would now profess to believe that Jonah sojourned in the belly of a fish. St. Paul in like manner treats the narrative of the Fall of Adam in Genesis as historical and connects a doctrine with it, though the mythical character of the narrative is admitted, as we have seen, even by a dignitary of the Church.

The Evangelists, simple-minded, find in the sacred books of their nation prognostications of the character and mission of Jesus. Sometimes, as critical examination shows, a little has been enough to satisfy their uncritical minds (see Matthew ii., 16; xxi., 5). But surely it is something like a platitude to ascribe to them such an idea of Old Testament prophecy as is worked out for us by modern divines such as Keith. No real and specific prediction of the advent of Jesus, or of any event in his life, can be produced from the books of the Old Testament.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At most we find passages or phrases which are capable of a spiritual application, and in that metaphorical sense prophetic. Even of the famous passage in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, if it is read without strong prepossessions, no more than this can be said.

Beyond contest and almost beyond compare is the beauty, spiritual as well as lyrical, of some of the Psalms. But there are others which it is shocking to hear a Christian congregation reciting, still more shocking, perhaps, to hear it chanting in a church. To wish that your enemy's wife may be a widow, and that his children may be fatherless and have none to pity them, is Oriental. To wish that his prayer may be turned to sin and that Satan may stand at his right hand, to wish in short for his spiritual ruin, is surely Oriental and something more. The writer in *Lux Mundi*, already cited, would persuade himself and us that these utterances are not those of personal spite, but "the claim which righteous Israel makes upon God that He should vindicate himself and let her eyes see how righteousness turns again to judgment." This is the way in which we have been led by our traditional belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament to play fast and loose with our understandings and with our moral sense. It might almost as well be pretended, when the Greek poet Theognis longs to drink the blood of his political enemies, that he is not actuated by hatred, but has some great moral object in his mind.

What is the Old Testament? It is the entire body of Hebrew literature, theology, philosophy, history, fiction, and poetry, including the poetry of love as well as that of religion. We have bound it all up together as a single book, and bound up that book with the New Testament, as though the religion of the two were the same and the slaughter of the Canaanites or the massacre of the day of Purim were a step towards Christian brotherhood and the Sermon on the Mount. We have forcibly turned Hebrew literature into a sort of cryptogram of Christianity. The love-song called The Song of Solomon has been turned into a cryptogrammic description of the union of Christ with his Church. A certain divine, when his advice was asked about the method of reading the Scriptures, used to say that his method was to begin at the beginning and read to the end; so that he would spend three hours at least on the Old Testament for one that he spent on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the New, and would read the list of the Dukes of Edom as often as he read the Sermon on the Mount. The first step towards a rational appreciation of the Old Testament is to break up the volume, separate the acts of Joshua or Jehu from the teachings of Jesus, and the different books of the Old Testament from each other.

The language of the Jews was the same as that of the other inhabitants of Canaan, and it seems probable that their religion also was originally the same. This view appears more likely and more consistent with analogy than the supposition that the Jews, having set out with tribal monotheism, fell away from it to fetishism, idolatry, and to the worship of the powers of nature, with sensual rites. We are told in fact (Joshua xxiv., 2) that the ancestors of Abraham served other gods. How, or by what influences, whether those of individual reformers like the prophets, or of general circumstance, the nation rose from fetishism and nature-worship to tribal monotheism of an eminently pure and exalted type seems to be a historical mystery. Higher than to tribal monotheism it did not rise; at least it advanced no further than to the belief that its god was supreme in power as well as in character to all other gods, and thus Lord of the whole earth. He was still the God of Israel, and the Jews were still his chosen people. Judaism, therefore, never reached the religious elevation of some chosen spirits among the heathen world, such as Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and Epictetus; although the Jewish belief was more intense than that of the philosophers and extended not only to a select circle but to a portion at least of the people.

Nor could the Jew, hampered as he was by lingering tribalism, form a conception of the universality and majesty of the moral law such as we find in Plato or in Cicero. There is nothing in the Hebrew writings like a passage in Cicero's *Republic*, preserved by Lactantius: "There is a true law, right reason, in unison with nature, all-embracing, consistent, and eternal, which, by its commands, calls to duty, by its prohibitions, deters from crime, which, however, never addresses to the good its commands or its prohibitions in vain, nor by command or prohibition moves the wicked. This law cannot be amended, nor can any clause of it be repealed, nor can it be abrogated as a whole. By no vote either of the Senate or of the people, can we be released from it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It requires none to explain or to interpret it. Nor will there be one law at Rome and another at Athens; one now, and another hereafter. For all nations and for all time there will be one law, immutable and eternal; there will be a common master and ruler of all—God, the framer, exponent, and enactor of this law, whom he who fails to obey will be recreant to himself, and, renouncing human nature, will, by that very fact, incur the severest punishment, even though he should escape other penalties real or supposed."* Equally broad is the language of the *De Legibus:* "Since, then, nothing is superior to reason, whether in God or man, it is by partnership in reason, above all, that man is connected with God. Partnership in reason is partnership in right reason; and as law is right reason, law again is a bond between God and man. Community of law is community of right. Those to whom these things are common are citizens of the same commonwealth. If men obey the same power and rule, much more do they obey this celestial code, the divine mind and the supreme power of God. So that we must regard this universe as one and a single commonwealth of gods and men. And whereas in states, on a principle of which we will speak in the proper place, the position of the citizen is marked by his family ties, in the universal nature of things we have something more august and glorious—the bond of kinship between gods and men."†

Of a belief in the immortality of the soul no evidence can be found in the Old Testament, though readers of the Bible who persist in using the unrevised version may remain under the impression that the doctrine is found in Job. Sheol is merely, like the Hades of the Odyssey, a shadowy abode of the Dead. The rewards and punishments of the Old Testament are temporal and material; its rewards are wealth and offspring, its punishments are beggary and childlessness. The only immortality of which there is any idea in it is the perpetuation of a man's family in his tribe. The vindication and requital of Job's virtue are added wealth and multiplied offspring. Nor do we find in the Old Testament that moral immortality, if the expression may be used, which is found in Greek and Roman philosophers, who, without speaking definitely of a life after death, identify the virtuous

* *Divin. Institt.*, VI., 8.
† *De Leg.*, I., 7.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man with the undying power of virtue and intimate that it would be well with him in the sum of things.

Not assuredly that the Hebrew literature lacks qualities, irrespective of its dogmatic position, such as may account for the hold which it has retained, in spite of its primeval cosmogony, theology, or morality, on the allegiance of civilized minds. The sublimity of its cosmogony impressed, as we know, Longinus. Voltaire himself could hardly have failed to acknowledge the magnificence of some parts of the prophetic writings, though in other parts he might find marks for his satire. All must be touched by the beauty of the story of Joseph, and the Book of Ruth. Admirable are both the religious exaltation and the lyrical excellence of some of the Psalms. The histories are marred by tribalism, primeval inhumanity, and fanaticism; but they derive dignity as well as unity from the continuous purpose which runs through them, and which in the main is moral; since Jehovah was a God of rightousness and purity, perhaps even of mercy, in contrast with the gods of other tribes, and his worship, though ritual, sacrificial, and unlike the worship "in spirit and in truth," the advent of which was proclaimed to the woman of Samaria, was yet spiritual compared with that of deities whose votaries gashed themselves with knives or celebrated lascivious orgies beneath the sacred tree.

Hebrew law is primitive, and the idea of reviving it, conceived by some of the Puritans, was absurd. But it is an improvement in primitive law. It makes human life sacred, treating murder as a crime to be punished with death, not as a mere injury to be compounded by a fine. It recognizes the avenger of blood, the rude minister of justice before the institution of police; but it confines his office to the case of wilful murder, and forbids hereditary blood-feuds. It recognizes asylum, a necessary check on wild primeval passion, but confines it to accidental homicide, ordaining that if a man slay his neighbor with guilt, he shall be taken, even from the altar, and put to death. It recognizes the father's power of life and death over his child, *patria potestas*, as the Roman called it, but unlike the hideous Roman law, it requires public procedure and a definite charge, while it secures mercy by requiring the concurrence of the mother. It recognizes polygamy, but strives to temper the jealousies and injustice of the harem. It is comparatively hospitable and liberal in its treatment of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stranger. Its Sabbath was most beneficent, especially to the slave, and strictness was essential to the observance among a primitive people. The ordeal is confined to the particular case of a wife suspected of infidelity, and divination is forbidden save by the Urim and Thummim. The law mitigates the customs of war, requiring that a city shall be summoned before it is besieged, and forbidding the cutting down of the fruit trees in a hostile country, which was regularly practiced by the Greeks; while the female captive, instead of being dragged at once to the bed of the captor, is allowed a month of mourning. Nor is war exalted or encouraged, as it was among the Assyrians and the Persians. Service is to be voluntary; captains are to be chosen only when the army takes the field, so that there would be no military class; horses and chariots are not to be multiplied. Jehovah, though a God of battles, is not characteristically so. Not victory in war, but peace, is the normal blessing. Kings it was expected the Israelites would have like the nations around them. But unlike the kings of the nations around them, their king was to be the choice of the nation, he was to be under the law, which he was to study that his heart might not be lifted up among his brethren, and his luxury, his harem, his accumulation of treasure, and his military establishment were to be kept within bounds. Finally, while there was to be a priestly order, that order was not to be a caste. The Levites were to be ordained by the laying on of the hands of the whole assembly of Israel. Nor, while the ritual was consigned to the priesthood, was religious teaching confined to them; its organs were the prophet and the psalmist. Worship was sacrificial, and all sacrifice is irrational. But there was no human sacrifice, and the scape-goat was a goat, not, as among the polished Athenians, a man. The American slave-owner could appeal to the Old Testament as a warrant for his institution. Slavery there was everywhere in primitive times, but the Hebrew slave-law is more merciful than that either of Greece or Rome, notwithstanding the ordinance, shocking to our sense, which held the master blameless for killing his slave if death was not immediate, on the ground that the slave "was his money."* The belief

*An essay written by the author on the question "Does the Bible Sanction American Slavery?" has probably been long since forgotten. In its line of argument against slavery as an anachronistic and immoral revival of a primitive and once moral institution it was consistent with the present paper. But the essay was written in the penumbra of orthodoxy and would now require very great modification.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in witchcraft as a crime to be punished by death unhappily is also true, and, though not prominent, gave birth in misguided Christendom to an almost incredible series of atrocities. How far these ordinances actually took effect, how far they were speculative and ideal, we cannot say. The ordinance against cutting down the fruit trees in an enemy's country certainly was not observed, for the fruit trees of the Moabites are cut down, Elisha giving the word (2 Kings, iii., 19). The agricultural polity of family freeholds, reverting to the family in the year of Jubilee, may safely be said to have never come into practical existence but to have been the ideal republic of some very Hebrew Plato. From the social point of view, perhaps the most notable passages of the Old Testament are those rebuking the selfishness of wealth and the oppression of the poor in the prophetic writings and the Psalms, which have supplied weapons for the champions of social justice. There is scarcely anything like these in Greek or Roman literature. Juvenal complains of the contempt and insult to which poverty exposes a man, but he does not denounce social oppression. In this respect the Mahometan and the Buddhist are perhaps superior to the Greek or Roman. But we shall hardly find anywhere a moral force equal in intensity to that of the Hebrew prophets, narrowly local and national though their preaching is.

Religion in the primitive state is completely identified with nationality. For a member of the tribe or of the nation which inherited the religion of the tribe to worship any but the tribal or national god or gods is treason punishable by death. "He that sacrificeth unto any god save unto the Lord only he shall be utterly destroyed." To the importation of this feature of an obsolete tribalism into Christianity, Christendom in part at least owes the fatal identification of the Church with the State, the extermination of the Albigenses, the religious wars, the Inquisition, the burning of Servetus. At the end of the seventeenth century a boy was put to death by the Calvinistic ministers of Scotland for having blasphemed the Lord by questioning the dogma of the Trinity.

That which is not a supernatural revelation may still, so far as it is good, be a manifestation of the Divine. As a manifestation of the Divine the Hebrew books, teaching righteouness and purity, may have their place in our love and admiration for ever;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the time has surely come when as a supernatural revelation they should be frankly though reverently laid aside, and no more allowed to cloud the vision of free inquiry or to cast the shadow of primeval religion and law over our modern life, as they do when Sabbatarianism debars us from innocent recreation on our day of rest; for it is the Jewish Sabbath that is really before the Sabbatarian's mind. It is useless, and is but paltering with the truth to set up, like the writer in *Lux Mundi*, the figment of a semi-inspiration. An inspiration which errs, which contradicts itself, which dictates manifest incredibilities, such as the stopping of the sun, Balaam's speaking ass, Elisha's avenging bears, or the transformation of Nebuchadnezzar, is no inspiration at all. It requires the supplementary action of human criticism to winnow the truth from the falsehood, and the result of the process varies with the personal tendencies of the critics. Nobody would ever have thought of it except as an expedient to cover retreat. We do but tamper with our own understandings and consciences by such attempts at once to hold on and let go, to retain the shadow of a belief when the substance has passed away. The believers in verbal inspiration, of whom some still remain, desperate as are the difficulties with which they have to contend, stand comparatively on firm ground. Verbal inspiration is at all events a consecrated tradition; semi-inspiration is a subterfuge, and nothing more. These are troublous times. The trouble is everywhere: in politics, in the social system, in religion. But the storm centre seems to be in the region of religion. The fundamental beliefs on which our social system has hitherto rested are giving way. To replace them before the edifice falls, and at the same time to give us such knowledge as may be attainable of man's estate and destiny, thought must be entirely free.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR BENEFITS FROM THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

BY ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

COLUMBUS died in the belief that the way to India and far Cathay led through the Caribbean Sea. His faith will in part be justified when the Nicaragua Canal is opened to the commercial navies of the world.

The dawn of the twentieth century will be the psychological moment for America—as the United States are popularly, though eclectically, called. She will then have reached the most critical stage conceivable in her development as a nation; and it were well that her statesmen, recognizing this fact, should be prepared to perform their duty as the trustees of those who have placed them in power. European nations, who have never ceased to threaten the Isthmus—the true path for sea-power between West and East, as Cromwell, Nelson, and even Columbus appear to have recognized—and, in particular, Great Britain, whose commercial interests predominate and whose navy is supposed to hold the command of the sea, may severally or collectively call upon America to make good her pretensions or to resign the proud position which Nature and the genius of her sons have clearly assigned to her. She will be pressed to decide, whether she aspires to the rank and responsibilities of a world-power, or is content to play the part of a Hanseatic Confederation, whose influence, however great, must necessarily be restricted within comparatively narrow and selfish limitations.

In these days of political and commercial rivalry, embracing the whole world, the nebulous Monroe Doctrine—as understood by the masses in America and Europe—will, of necessity, be dissipated, unless it be condensed into some visible form of resistance against the encroachment of Europe. In plain words, the Monroe Doctrine, in its negative, protective, and final aspects,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can only be upheld by force of arms: by a navy capable of disputing the claims of the world to a closer share in the development of Central and South America, or by an ally, who, for a consideration, may be willing to guarantee the preservation of American interests. As an Englishman, I should like to see Great Britain presiding over the projected Isthmian Canal; but, as a geographer, who may be permitted to regard such issues from a philosophical point of view, I am compelled to admit, that the claims of America, in spite of many reasons which invalidate them, are, morally speaking, in excess of all others. For her the unfettered possession of the canal is a matter of vital concern, involving her very existence as a free and independent people; but for Europe it means simply commercial and political aggrandisement.

The question is, therefore: Will American statesmen have sufficient patriotism and foresight to subordinate personal ambition to the progressive requirements of a virile population?

We all know that the development and expansion of nationalities follow the lines of the least resistance, and are governed by inflexible natural laws. Equally well-known are the principles governing the redistribution of trade centres resulting from the opening up of new channels of commerce. That America can continue to maintain her position of isolation and reserve in the family of nations is contrary to the teaching of history. Even in recent years this has been shown to be theoretically impossible. In the question regarding Hawaii, America lost a favorable opportunity of acquiring a naval base that may be absolutely essential to her in the future—indeed, the chief strategic position in the Pacific; and in the Nicaraguan dispute she honorably acted up to the true principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and thereby renounced forever the spread-eagle claims with which it had hitherto been invested, at least in popular estimation. Her action in raising the diplomatic rank of her chief European ministers to that of ambassadors may be held to indicate that her relations with foreign powers are daily becoming more intimate and important: indeed, her recent pacific intervention between China and Japan proves this beyond dispute.

These, and other examples which might be cited, point to the fact that the United States have outgrown their Constitution, and must, of necessity, assume a positive and progressive, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against a negative and retrocessional, attitude towards the world. Should America elect to adopt a distinct foreign policy, with all its consequences, she will, of course, require a navy capable of enforcing her diplomatic representations. Has America such a navy? Indeed, one may ask, without reflecting on the capacity of this arm of the service, which all the world knows to be most efficient, has America a sufficiently strong navy at the present day to venture upon the dangerous expedient of uniting the Atlantic with the Pacific?

In the event of war between Great Britain and France, the British Channel Squadron must first be defeated before her enemy can venture upon invading England; and yet we hesitate to help France by constructing a Channel tunnel uniting the two countries, in spite of the obvious facilities for destroying it at a moment's notice. When the Nicaragua Canal is opened, Europe will be brought to the very doors of America—to her chief strategic naval base. The West Indies will partially regain their former political importance, and of these islands Jamaica, in the hands of Great Britain, practically commands the Atlantic entrance to the canal. On the Pacific seaboard, the Galapagos Islands, belonging to Ecuador, appear to me to be the most suitable naval base for protecting an Isthmian canal. Can America, under existing circumstances, uphold her political supremacy and guarantee the protection of her commercial interests?

By the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty (1850) Great Britain and America not only agreed to neutralize any canal that might be built across the Isthmus, but also bound themselves to abstain from any annexations of territory in Central America.* To Great Britain, holding the command of the sea, it is of no great consequence whether or not she be debarred from further political domination over the Isthmus, provided the Canal remains neutralized, but to America such abstention would appear to be no longer possible.

The present disturbance of the balance of power in the Pacific by the uprising of Japan, a formidable military and naval power, and the consequent destruction of the Chinese myth; the impulse given to international, and especially British, commerce

* The English settlement at Belize, now called British Honduras, is, I am aware, regarded in America as an infringement of this treaty; but there were special pre-existing conditions which, under the subsequent convention with Guatemala (1859), constituted a legitimate, though contested, claim on the part of Great Britain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Pacific by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in connection with fast steamers (armed cruisers) shortening the route between Europe and Eastern Asia; the projected direct cables along this new pathway of commerce; and finally, the inevitable construction of the Nicaragua Canal—all these are events indicating the advent of a time, not so very remote, when the Pacific will vie with the Atlantic as a pathway to the far East. The route through the Suez Canal is open to many objections, on account of the dangers to sea-borne commerce in time of war.

The favorable geographical position of America, presiding over one of the chief *foci* of international commerce and holding what may be the key to the future command of the sea, offers a national ambition which no statesman can afford to neglect. Similar conditions led to the creation of the Roman Empire and to the expansion of Great Britain. Will America, with these examples before her, accept the greatness that is thrust upon her, and recognize her responsibilities; and will her sons respond to the call thus made upon her courage and resources? These are questions that must be answered soon.

An ever-increasing navy, an adequate army, naval bases and coaling stations—if not colonies—must necessarily hamper for many years to come the internal development of a young country. Add to these, the adoption of a sound foreign policy, with all its consequences, and America may well hesitate on the course which is marked out for her, directly the Nicaragua Canal is opened to traffic. But as "Rome was not built in a day," and as the British Empire is the growth of centuries of strenuous effort, America may comfort herself with the hope that "sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." The only comfort denied her is, that if she refuse to occupy vital strategic positions well within her grasp, some other power may snap them up. If her Constitution prohibit national expansion, all one can say is: So much the worse for the Constitution, which in these days ought to be sufficiently robust to stand "the higher criticism."

Having roughly outlined the political aspect of our subject, we may now glance at the co-related conditions of international commerce, in regard to the displacement of trade centres by the marriage of the Pacific with the Atlantic. If, politically speaking, the opening of the Nicaragua Canal carries with it many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dangers as well as advantages to the development of America, the commercial prospects may be said to promise nothing but profit.

The relation between trade routes and distributing centres is a subject of the highest importance, not only to merchants, but also, and in a greater degree, to the statesmen who direct and control the colonial and foreign affairs of a country. That this relation is of the most intimate kind, and the result of a natural law which has been evident since the days when the civilizations of China, India, Arabia, and the Mediterranean were first evolved, is a well-marked historical fact. To go no further back than the inauguration of the Suez Canal, about twenty-five years ago, Great Britain is still experiencing the unfavorable results of the deflection of commerce from the Cape route to that by the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal. Instead of London being the chief distributing centre of the riches of the Far East, as in earlier times, there have arisen in the Mediterranean basin a number of competitive centres. The Mediterranean Powers thus enjoy a partial revival of their ancient prosperity. To Great Britain, as the monopolist of the sea-borne commerce of the world, this has proved a serious financial loss, and it is only by seeking compensation elsewhere, *e. g.*, in the acquisition of new markets, that her merchants can hope to retain their paramount advantages.

But, perhaps, the fundamental reason—apart from maritime and colonial enterprise—why Great Britain has distanced her rivals is that she is the only power enjoying the facilities of Free Trade. Whilst all other powers are Protectionist, in the largely unfulfilled hope of nourishing their growing industries, Great Britain has never deviated from her present fiscal policy since the time of its adoption. Every market in the world, which can be approached by sea, is at her disposal. The absurdity to which Protection has been carried, especially by America, in the vain attempt to keep out British exports and to undermine British commerce, need not be insisted upon in these pages. Every country in the world has been fertilized by British capital—to the extent, it is said, of no less than two thousand millions of pounds sterling. So long, then, as Great Britain pursues a Free Trade policy, and other countries are hampered by Protection, so long will she continue to dominate the markets of the world. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America were to adopt Free Trade principles she would indeed become a formidable rival.

When the Nicaragua Canal is opened, British freights to San Francisco will be handicapped, as compared with cargoes from the Eastern States of the Union. At present the distance from New York to San Francisco, by Cape Horn, is 15,900 miles, and from Liverpool 16,900 miles, or six per cent. further; but when the Canal is opened, New York will be 4,200 miles from San Francisco, and Liverpool 8,200 miles, or no less than ninety-six per cent. further; thus *doubling* the distance of Europe as compared with the Atlantic States from the Pacific Coast. On the reverse side, from the American point of view, one can well understand the opposition of the trans-continental American railways to the opening up of a short sea route between Atlantic and Pacific trade centres.

Again, when the Nicaragua Canal is opened, the Atlantic States of North America will be within a short distance from the Pacific States of South America; although it is believed that, south of Callao, the carrying trade, by sailing vessels at least, would follow its present course round Cape Horn, in order to escape the canal dues and the light baffling breezes under the Equator. But in this case, steamships would replace sailing vessels and carry American trade much further south.

In conclusion, I may be permitted to formulate a new doctrine, as against the Monroe doctrine:

First, That the welfare of the United States of America is bound up with the maintenance of the British Empire;

Second, That, when the Nicaragua Canal is opened, the United States will be in a position to assume or reject the rank and responsibilities of a world-power; and

Third, That the United States, in alliance with Great Britain and her Colonies, would inevitably lead to the hegemony of the English-speaking race.

The increasing popularity of marriages between American heiresses and British peers encourages the hope that, since nations and individuals develop along parallel lines, America and Great Britain will recognize the obvious advantages of a *mariage de convenance*.

ARTHUR SILVA WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE SECOND EMPIRE.

XII.—THE END OF THE EMPIRE.

BY ALBERT D. VANDAM, AUTHOR OF "AN ENGLISHMAN IN PARIS," "MY PARIS NOTE-BOOK," ETC., ETC.

I REACHED Paris on Saturday night, 16th July, 1870, hence four-and-twenty hours after the virtual though not official declaration of war between France and Prussia. I had no longer a home in the French capital, for both my relatives were gone. In spite of all that I had heard and seen for fourteen years, during which I had been an attentive listener and, considering my age, a careful observer, I felt almost certain that France would hold her own in the forthcoming struggle, but I did not imagine for a single instant that she would inflict a crushing defeat on her adversary such as her adversary eventually inflicted on her.

Before I went to bed that night my opinions had undergone a considerable change—I will not say a radical one. I did not like the tone of the prologue. I am no physiognomist, but I candidly own that I have more faith in the man who at the hour of supreme danger sets his teeth tightly and stares as if his eyes would come out of their sockets, than in the man who grins open-mouthed and yells and rolls his eyes in a fine frenzy.

I cannot speak from personal experience of the attitude and demeanor of the Berlin people in July, 1870, but there is, perhaps, more valuable evidence than mine in that respect. It is that of a representative Frenchman in the highest sense of the term.* "At seven o'clock in the evening of the 19th (July), the Secretary of the Senate handed me my passports. I was ready to start, and I left Hamburg immediately. Behind me lay Germany, up-

* M. G. Rothan, Minister-Plenipotentiary to the Hanseatic Free Towns.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

risen from one end to the other and rushing to arms, grave, solemn, full of hatred, conscious that she was engaging in a mortal struggle, ready for every sacrifice. In Paris I only beheld people yielding to violent excitement, tumultuous scenes, bands of drunken men indulging in patriotic saturnalias. The contrast was heartrending."

What was heartrending to the truly patriotic Frenchman became well-nigh disgusting to the alien with less fiercely pulsing blood in his veins, but who, alien though he was, had learned to love France during and for the many happy years he had spent within her borders. I was almost sorry I had come to Paris; the confidence of the previous four-and-twenty hours in France's ability to confront the imminent danger with something like moderate results received a shock there and then.

It took me nearly an hour to get to the Café de la Paix, where I knew I should find the only man in Paris whom I could frankly ask for information without exposing myself to the risk of a rebuff and worse perhaps. Joseph Ferrari was my uncles' old friend, and knew their nephew well enough not to suspect him of being a spy in the pay of Bismarck. Diplomatically he was not only the best-informed man in France, but the man who had probably thoroughly sifted whatever information he had got and subjected the residuum to the most critical analysis.

Ferrari was seated outside the café amidst a group of seven or eight, Imperialists to a man. I knew most of them by sight, but no more. Ferrari shook hands with me very cordially, but did not even ask me when I had arrived. It was the first time we met since, a twelvemonth earlier, we had parted on the platform of the Northern Railway Station, whither he had accompanied the remains of my younger uncle on their way to their last resting-place in a little cemetery near Amsterdam, where the yellow waters of the Y splash in low, plaintive ripples against the shore.

I took the hint, ordered some coffee, and sat silently by his side for nearly three hours, at the end of which I had arrived, at any rate, at the conclusion, that if Bismarck, as was alleged at the time, spent a great deal of money in maintaining a staff of spies in France, he was absolutely flinging those sums out of the window. There was no need to go hunting for secret information; everything worth knowing seemed to be known to at least a half dozen persons nearest to the Emperor, and they in their turn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made no scruple in telling their friends. A decently-bred and well-dressed man, provided with a couple of letters of introduction to some of the best-known deputies and officials, or to a couple of members of the court circle, would simply have to listen. In less than an hour, for instance, I felt perfectly certain with regard to two or three main points. There was neither a fixed plan of mobilization nor a plan of campaign. With regard to the alliances France might possibly have contracted, all Ferrari's interlocutors agreed that various attempts had been made to secure them; but while one section stoutly maintained that the treaties relating to them were lying sealed and signed in the archives at the Quai d'Orsay, the other was equally positive that the negotiations had altogether fallen through. And yet all these men surrounding Ferrari, and intelligent to a degree—though, of course, intellectually, not to compare with him—would have gasped at the bare suggestion that their country might be crushed in the coming struggle.

"Now, you have heard the bells ring, but you do not know who pulls the ropes," said Ferrari to me that night as I left him at his door. "I fancy I can show you not only the bell-ringers themselves, but enlighten you as to the substance of the ropes they are pulling." And from that hour until a few days after Woerth, when I left Paris temporarily, he indicated to me the "undercurrents" that had been and were still at work. The information gathered from him piecemeal, as well as what I saw personally during those three weeks, is embodied in the following pages. I have, moreover, read and heard a good deal since, which, for convenience' sake, I will incorporate here instead of making separate footnotes.

"You heard the whole of them last night," Ferrari said next morning; "you heard the whole of them last night talking about France's alliances. There is not a word of truth in the statements of either of the parties. There is not a single treaty to that effect deposited in the archives of the *Ministère des Affaires Étrangères*, nor have any negotiations fallen through. Both Austria and Italy—Napoleon's main dependence—are playing a waiting game; if you want it more plainly, both Nigra and Metternich are leading the Emperor and Gramont by the nose. It would not be very difficult to do this with regard to the latter under any circumstances; it would be more difficult with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Emperor but for his excruciating disease, which leaves him rest neither night nor day except under the influence of morphia, and I defy the most clear-headed intellect to work out a problem or to pursue even its own thoughts under such conditions. Except Conneau and a few doctors, no one suspects how ill he really is, for your Napoleon, whom I like nearly as much as your uncles did, is a real man of courage. If he were not so ill as he is, he might become alive to the fact just now that those Rhine provinces which are fundamentally the sole cause of the mischief are unattainable, or at any rate not attainable by the means he proposes to attain them by, namely, by attacking Prussia and by inviting Austria and Italy to help him.

"To begin with, Austria and Italy will not, cannot, and dare not help France. Let me explain to you why.

"I will leave Italy aside for a moment. In the first place because such aid as she may be able to afford to France will be almost worthless without the equally active co-operation of Austria. In order to be of any use at all, Italy would have to call out at least 100,000 troops, and in her present state of military organization it would take her at least six or seven weeks to do this—that is, if the two burning questions, those of the temporal sovereignty of the Papacy and the occupation of Rome, had been satisfactorily settled to the advantage of Italy beforehand. Without that, I tell you, there is not the remotest chance of Italy's stirring a finger. I know my country better than the Emperor, and feel positive that, if Victor Emmanuel attempted to mobilize his army without that stipulation—and mind, a public, not a secret, stipulation—his army, much as it loves him, would refuse to move at his bidding, provided it did not stir against him. Our statesmen at the risk of being taxed with ingratitude say to themselves, 'Italy's position with regard to her unification—read with regard to the possession of Rome—would not be improved by a victory of France over Prussia; it would be seriously improved by a defeat of France, or even by a *drawn* campaign, which would necessarily lead to a Congress.' This, I own, is black ingratitude, but I am not responsible for it, and, if I were, I would follow the tactics of Lanza or whosoever stood in his place.

"Granted, however, that all those difficulties be satisfactorily removed offhand, I repeat, it will take, then, six weeks to mobil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ize 100,000 troops, which, if Austria still holds aloof by that time, will have to be directed on to Lyons, and have to cross a great part of France by rail. By then, take my word for it, the issue of the struggle will have been virtually decided. If France be able to hold her own single-handed for six or seven weeks after the real outbreak of the war, she will be able to do so afterwards, and will need no help of any one—provided she interprets the words 'holding her own' in their most literal sense. If she attempts territorial aggrandisement—the territorial aggrandisement Napoleon has been dreaming of for years—under no matter what specious title, she will practically make a scourge for her own back, for in spite of Napoleon's hare-brained theories on the subject, the South German States want none of his protection against Prussia; and if they do not rally around her now, they would rally round her then; and what is more, Austria, who is wavering now, who, like Italy, is waiting to see how the cat jumps, would waver no longer. Austria's love, like Juliet's, would spring from her only hate. She would scarcely care to see Würtemberg and Bavaria under French protection or allied to France, for in such conditions Baden would scarcely prove an obstacle to an otherwise unhindered march of the French into Bohemia. Austria has had enough of that kind of thing under Napoleon's uncle."

"Then why those drafts of projected treaties at the existence of which you yourself hinted?" I asked.

"Did not I tell you that both Austria and Italy are waiting to see how the cat jumps? If those drafts exist, and I feel certain of the existence of one, and nearly certain of the existence of the other, then final execution, I mean the signing of them by the three contracting parties, would still be dependent on so many conditions that at the last moment one or both of France's contemplated allies might find a pretext for retreat. Do not lose sight of the following facts. Austria will not act without Italy. That is no surmise on my part, but an ascertained fact. Austria is, moreover, a Catholic power, and as such determined to maintain the temporal sovereignty of the Papacy, which Italy is equally determined to destroy. . . . But," and here he took out his watch, "I have outstayed my time; I shall see you again by and bye, and will tell you more."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With which he left me to my own devices and reflections. The former were few, the latter many. Under different circumstances, I should have looked up my French acquaintances. After an absence of more than a twelvemonth, I should have had a friendly welcome, albeit that during that twelvemonth not one had probably given a thought to me. The Parisian character is essentially constituted like that. Out of sight, out of mind. But I felt not certain of my reception in the present state of affairs. So I made up my mind to have luncheon by myself and to wander about the streets in the afternoon. My uncles and I had frequently dined at the Faisan Doré, in the Rue des Martyrs. As I grew up, I lunched there now and again when the state of my purse would run to it, and when the fare of the Brasserie des Martyrs, next door, or Dinochaux's, hard by in the Rue Bréda, was not to my taste. Consequently, I was not altogether a stranger there. I might have been, for all the notice I got on my entering the establishment from the principal down to the cashier and the waiters, *all of whom* had seen me but a twelvemonth before. On the 13th or 14th July I should probably have had a sign of recognition and a smile from every one; on the 16th I had become an enemy to France, perhaps a spy. I have never set foot in the Faisan Doré since, though for five years I had to pass its doors twice a day to go and eat elsewhere.

I ate my meal in silence, notwithstanding the familiar faces of several of the customers. I went out, and at the corner of the Faubourg Montmartre ran against my friend Körner. "I am glad I met you before I go," he said, holding out his hand; "let us have the stirrup cup, if it be only the stirrup cup of coffee," he laughed, no doubt in allusion to my frugal habits in the way of liquor.

"But I thought that in virtue of certain laws you were exempt from military service," I remarked, when we were seated.

"So I am," he answered.

"Then you are going to join as a volunteer?"

He looked amazed. "I am not going as a volunteer at all. I was born in Paris, that's true, but I am too German to fight on the side of the French, and too conscientious to fight against them. So I am going to Brussels." Then he stopped, but in another moment he went on. "Practically, this is the doing of the French themselves, who maintain that men of German blood,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even if born in France, can never become Frenchmen. They are right, nevertheless. I should have stayed here to await events if the manager of the bank had not dismissed me yesterday morning, without rhyme or reason apparently. 'You had better be gone, monsieur,' he said. 'I cannot have you here. Your fellow-clerks would make life intolerable to you.' With this he handed me a voucher for a month's salary. I went home somewhat crestfallen, I own. On the doorstep I was met by my concierge. 'Monsieur,' she whispered, 'the proprietor has asked me to tell you to remove your furniture as soon as possible, and yourself with it. He will make you a present of the quarter's rent that has begun. It is not his fault, perhaps. This morning, after you were gone, the tenants came down in a body, and swore that, if you were not out of the house in forty-eight hours, they would be, and the proprietor might fish for his rent.' 'But, madame,' I remonstrated, 'I was born and bred in this house; my mother, father, and grandfather died here. Where am I to go?' '*Ah, ça,*' she replied, shrugging her shoulders as only a Frenchwoman can, '*ça ne me regarde pas.*' And she went on with her sweeping; which indifference did not prevent her from accepting fifty francs this morning under the following circumstances. As you know, my grandfather died in January, and I felt very lonely in this large flat by myself. I thought of giving it up, and, in fact, gave notice to that effect at the end of the March quarter. About six weeks ago I became engaged, and the flat not being let, I decided to keep it on. You know that I am not altogether dependent on my salary at the bank. If all had gone well, I should have been married by the end of the month. I went straight to my wife's parents to tell them what had happened; before I could open my lips, my fiancée's father informed me that my engagement was broken off. There was a lot of highfalutin' about the enemies to his country. I did not take the trouble to answer him, and turned on my heel. But there I was with a houseful of furniture on my hand, and nowhere to put it, for I knew that if I did not shift it within forty-eight hours it would be flung into the street, and I knew, equally, that it would be of no use to appeal to the law at this moment. Three people to whom I successively applied to move and store it refused. They virtually gave me the same answer. They were not going to help a German to get his chattels away, and as for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

storing it, they would not be defiled by the furniture's contact. I went to a fourth to try and sell it. The answer was the same. The concierge has sold it for me; she said it was left for rent. At a rough guess it is worth about 4,000 francs, for it was all very good and solid. I got 900 francs for it, out of which I gave the concierge 50 francs."

In the evening I told Ferrari the story. "That's just it," he laughed. "Napoleon, with his ridiculous theory of nationalities, pretends that the mere fact of annexing them would convert those Germans on the left bank of the Rhine into Frenchmen, when two centuries of French rule, and by no means stringent rule, have failed to do so in the case of the Alsatians. Look at the Irish in America and the French in Canada; they have remained Irish and French in spite of everything. But all this is of a piece with Napoleon's dream of turning Austria, the persistent enemy of France, into her friend. Henri IV. and Richelieu, who were as good politicians as the son of Hortense, looked at Austria in that light. But Austria is clever, and hating France, as she does and always did, does not mind making a cat's-paw of her. Francis Joseph sends M. and Mme. de Metternich to Eugénie, who worries her husband into a war with Prussia which she calls *'ma guèrre, à moi'*; for Napoleon, in spite of those confounded Rhine provinces, would probably have continued to trust to his sinuous policy to get them. Why the Emperor should persist in regarding Austria as a friend beats my comprehension, and why he should imagine that Austria looks upon France in a friendly light is still more puzzling to me. Marie Louise, the consort of the greatest man that ever lived, shakes the dust of France from off her feet the moment she can; she leaves her son to the tender mercies of her father and old Metternich; on the evening of the day she learns the news of Napoleon the Great's death she goes to the theatre as if nothing had happened. Antommarchi, who comes to tell her of the hero's death, is not even received by her. The Duc de Reichstadt is practically sequestrated, and his grandfather sanctions all the questionable proceedings of his mother with regard to him. Now look at the other side. Marie Antoinette is murdered in France; the first Napoleon simply treads Austria under foot, and when he marries one of her daughters still conspires against her (against Austria); Napoleon's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nephew despoils Austria in Italy. In the day of Austria's trouble with Prussia, he leaves Austria to face that trouble by herself, although his policy dictates to him a different course; the death of Maximilian, the madness of Maximilian's wife, are virtually Louis Napoleon's doings. Notwithstanding all this, he is befooled by Francis Joseph and Metternich *fils* on the strength of a few sheets of paper which are not even signed, for those sheets of paper do exist, although in due time, if it suits her, Austria will deny this.* But even if they were signed they would be no good, as Andrassy warned the Emperor as early as three years ago. 'Permit me to observe to your Majesty,' he said at Salzburg, 'that a treaty only counts in proportion to its possibility of execution; and I can guarantee your Majesty that Hungary will never allow Austria to make war upon Prussia.' I can only ascribe Napoleon's blindness to the desperate state of his health; for as far as I can see, unless a miracle save both, he is leading France and himself to headlong destruction.

"That he is very ill there is not the least doubt. In a consultation held a fortnight ago between six of the most eminent medical men of France, it was considered necessary to proceed immediately to an operation. But Nélaton shirked the responsibility, owing to his want of success with Niel last year. And now it is too late."

This is but a small instalment of the prognostications of Ferrari. After that, the successive defeats of Reichshofen, Woerth, Beaumont and Sedan were no surprise to me, and when I landed again in Paris on the afternoon of the 3d September, I was prepared for the sequel to Sedan. Yet I thought there might be found a man to save the situation. M. Estancelin, the eminent champion of the Orleanist cause, who is barely recovering from a severe accident as I write, well nigh saved that situation in the Palais Bourbon. But for Trochu, who hesitated, he would have succeeded. Lesseps saved the Tuileries from being sacked and burned on the 4th September. Not for long though.

And the Second Empire finished more ignominiously than it had begun.

ALBERT D. VANDAM.

* Ferrari spoke prophetically. Austria did deny the existence of those draft treaties a few years later on, and when the Empress wished to refute the falsehood by producing the documents, they had disappeared from Chiselhurst.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILD TRAITS IN TAME ANIMALS.

IV.—THE PIG.

BY DR. LOUIS ROBINSON.

THE sheep and the pig may be classed apart from other domestic animals in one particular. Man makes but little use of them during their lifetime. With the exception of the annual tribute of wool which he exacts from the sheep, he chiefly benefits by appointing himself their sole heir and executor, and then arranging for their seasonable demise.

Beyond this unfortunate fellowship the sheep and the pig have but little in common either in habits or history. The more we examine them, the more evident it becomes that they have been developed among utterly different surroundings. Yet in both cases, all the characteristics which render them so valuable to us, served to preserve them during long epochs before the commencement of their captivity.

We now chiefly regard a live hog as so much perambulating bacon. His other physical and moral qualities are totally eclipsed by ideas about the number of pounds of pork which we hope and intend to inherit from him. Let us first, then, consider whence he gets his aptitude for laying on fat. Of course, it is plain that no wild animal could long exist in the condition of the prize hogs which we see exhibited in agricultural shows. Long continued and assiduous care has been exercised by men in enhancing this quality in the domestic breeds both in America and Europe, and in an even greater degree in the far East. Indeed, we are indebted for the delicate flavor and general high quality of our pork to the ingenious Chinaman nearly as much as for our tea and china tea-cups.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The wild boar of Europe is a scraggy giant who would need a vast deal of civilizing before his gaunt and sinewy frame could be cushioned over with the proper thickness and quality of adipose tissue. Very many years ago, breeders found that the European pigs were much improved by being crossed with the Chinese. These are of a different race altogether, and are not found wild anywhere at the present day. The careful Mongolians have kept and improved them for untold centuries, and this doubtless accounts for their superiority from the farmers' point of view.

But the disposition to lay on an enormous amount of fat when food is plentiful dates back far beyond the beginning of the Chinese Empire. And what is more, it was a most necessary habit of the pig's wild ancestors in any but hot climates; for in all probability the hog which did not get fat in the fall would perish during a hard winter. One would not think that there was much resemblance between fat pork and honey, yet analysts tell us that they are chemically very similar. In both cases they were, in the first place, stores laid up for winter use by their respective owners, which man, the arch-plunderer, has appropriated for his own purposes. There was this difference, however, that whereas the bees accumulated their savings in a joint stock bank the pig carried his about with him.

Throughout the spring and summer in Northern and Central Europe, the wild hog, by diligently grubbing for roots and whatever else he could find, managed to make a bare living. But when autumn came and the acorns and beech-mast fell, he revelled in plenty. Moreover, at this season, many of his enemies, such as the bears, were feasting on the ripe berries and nuts, so that he was left in comparative peace. The result was that, in the few weeks between the fall of the mast and the first severe weather, he filled out amazingly. Then came the winter, during which he had to face the cold, and find what food he could beneath the snow or on the hard frozen ground. Towards the end of winter the most trying time came. The earth was still hard with frost, and every nut or acorn in the forest had been picked up by the thousands of hungry searchers. The pig was no longer fat; his inward store had well nigh been consumed. It was always an anxious question with him whether he would "save his bacon" until the breaking of the frost.

You will see then that the hog, which had within his own private bank a dollar's worth of savings, in the form of lard,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when his fellows were insolvent, would in an exceptionally protracted and severe winter be one of the few to survive. He would naturally transmit his fattening tendencies to his descendants, and so it comes about that, in the present day, no animal so handsomely responds to liberal feeding as the domestic pig.

Many other beasts which live under somewhat the same conditions share with the hog this faculty for accumulating a store of fat during the fall, but in no other case has it been taken advantage of by man to such an extent.

There are two other characteristics of the pig which we find of great value; viz.: his tough skin and bristly coat. We will now discuss the natural origin of these. We have seen that the horse, the ass, the sheep, and the goat, found it necessary to retire from low and marshy regions where cover was abundant and which swarmed with voracious foes.

Not so the wild hog. He stayed and faced the danger. If you observe the shape of a lean pig you see at once that he has been built for forcing his way through dense canebrakes and jungles. He is shaped something like a submarine boat or a Whitehead torpedo. His nose is the thin end of a wedge or rather a cone for forcing apart the close-set stems of his native thickets. His hide, especially about the shoulders and back, is extraordinarily tough.

The bristly covering of the wild hog is a perfect protection against the thorns and he will plunge at headlong speed through dense masses of bramble and briar where no other animal of his size and weight could follow. If any of us were to pursue the same track we should get our clothes, and afterwards our skins, torn to shreds. He merely gets his hair thoroughly combed and rather likes it than otherwise.

The true wild boars and the *feral* hogs which have escaped from captivity in various parts of the world, go about in herds for mutual protection; and when one is attacked the others stand by him and defend him. This affords an explanation of the original use of the shrill voice of the pig, and of his readiness to exercise it whenever he is in trouble. In fact, whenever you hear a pig squealing you hear a testimony to the intrepid deeds of his race in the past, as eloquent and emphatic as a Fourth of July oration. In the wild state it was his appeal for help, to which he knew his brethren, one and all, would respond with splendid loyalty and courage. Many a hunter has had to climb a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tree to save his life after wounding one of a herd of peccaries. Now the hog would not expend his breath in ear splitting squeaks unless he felt pretty sure of getting some benefit from so doing. His squealing, therefore, amounts to a lively expression of faith in the noble moral qualities of his brethren. It conveys precisely the same sentiment as do the words of a stump orator when he says: "Gentlemen, I well know your constancy and your courage! You have proved many times in the past that you are no mugwumps who go to roost on a fence when the party is in danger! I confidently look to you therefore to stand by me in the present tremendous crisis."

The continual grunting of the pig is also of interest as revealing something of the conditions of life of his wild ancestors. A herd of swine scattered in the long grass or among the brackens of a European forest would soon lose sight of one another. But the grunts of each would still advertise his presence to his neighbors; and so the individual members of the herd would not lose touch with the main body. Then there are grunts and grunts. If one of my readers will imitate the ingenious Mr. Garner, and take a phonograph to the nearest pig-sty he might get material to make up a book on the language and grammar of the hog. However thick the jungle the wild pig could, by taking note of the pitch and emphasis of the grunts to right and left of him tell pretty much what his hidden colleagues were thinking about.

There is another peculiarity of the *suidæ*, or pig tribe, which is of great importance to the farmer, and which at the same time tells a tragic tale of the circumstances of the early forefathers of our domestic hogs. They are very prolific, and produce from half a dozen to twenty at a birth, whereas the other animals which we have discussed produce as a rule only one or two.

Now, in a state of freedom the number of individuals of an established species remains fairly constant from year to year. If they doubled every year, the world would soon be overpopulated. Supposing they increased ten fold and could find sustenance, it would not take many generations to pack the whole surface of the earth with hogs as closely as a Chicago pork factory yard before a grand kill. There must, therefore, be a corresponding annual destruction of life to make up for the increase, or, more properly speaking, the rate of increase must become adjusted to the amount of annual waste.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But what a state of affairs this reveals! Out of every family of a dozen only one or two were left alive by the following spring. Truly the pig paid dearly for his pig-headedness in sticking to the forest and the swamp! The wolf and the bear, the lynx and the panther were the chief factors in this fearful process of subtraction. You may take it as a general law that when a beast is a member of a large family, born at the same time as himself, his prospects of long life are not good. A life assurance society would not take him at any price, except in the annuity department, nor would a company which grants compensation for accidents.

The natural term of life of the pig is longer than that of the sheep, and the frightful mortality implied by the above facts is therefore due to violence in nearly every case. If he is not made a meal of by a prowling enemy he will probably be killed in battle, for most wild boars will cheerfully attack anything from a kitten to a locomotive.

Even this reckless valour of the pig has been made use of by man in the districts which once swarmed with rattlesnakes; and, curiously enough, directly the grunting warrior appears, the snake seems to know that he has met his match. I should not wonder if some very remote and gallant ancestors of the hog bore the brunt of that deadly war between the reptilian and the warm-blooded inhabitants of the earth to which I alluded in a previous paper.

If so we owe him a debt of gratitude greater than we imagine. What if, after all, "the gintleman that pays the rint," were the real St. Patrick who cleared Ireland of snakes?

LOUIS ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BY SIR REGINALD F. D. PALGRAVE, K. C. B., CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

To two essays, headed "The House of Representatives and the House of Commons," that Mr. Herbert and Mr. Taylor have contributed to this REVIEW,* I have been asked to furnish a rejoinder. My predecessors on these pages have skilfully and ably stated the arguments they seek to urge: the one as an advocate for the House of Representatives as it is, the other for the House as it might be if an important change was made in its organization; and they attain with much success the diverse ends towards which they strive. But in the main object they have at heart, which is to meet the wide-spread dissatisfaction that is felt respecting Congress, both Mr. Herbert and Mr. Taylor have found that a comparison between the usages of the House of Representatives and of the House of Commons affords them only slight assistance.

This conclusion was inevitable, as comparison between these two most dissimilar institutions is unattainable. The contrast, both outward and inward, between the two Houses is absolute. The Commons are a fighting body, who make and unmake ministries, and might try to upset the British Constitution. The House of Representatives are a digestive body, whose function is to assimilate legislation, coupled with a limited power of worrying the Executive Government; but with no power of touching even the fringe of the Constitution in which America has wrapped herself.

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, March, 1894, and August, 1894.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Institutions marching toward such contrary directions along the highway of the world are so completely sundered that they cannot be brought within the same area of vision. Forms of procedure, however, must be, to a certain extent, alike, whether in the Parliaments of Japan or of Jericho, especially if the procedure regulates the same class of transaction. Such comments as I may venture upon regarding the ways of Congress shall accordingly be limited to the rival methods adopted in Washington and Westminster for dealing with public money.

Some consideration must, in the first instance, be applied to the results achieved by the two most capable precursors, who have entered before me upon the congressional and parliamentary arena. Mr. Herbert's aim is to show that the House of Representatives not only do their work satisfactorily, but that they could not do it in any other way. With sagacious insight he concentrates his defensive energies upon the committee organization adopted by the House. His adoption of this position is well chosen, as he defends the very being of the House of Representatives by defending the committee system, for that system is the all in all of that assembly.

Owing to the national jealousy of anything approaching a one-man power, and the consequent absence of any single authority, the House of Representatives have sought to acquire the motive force necessary to urge on and to regulate their energies, by a subdivision of authority; by the delegation of their power to fifty-six standing committees.

That a body politic, which has knotted up its constitutional fibres into fifty-six discordant nerve centres, must act in a distracted way seems certain enough; and according to public opinion that is the case with the House of Representatives. Mr. Herbert, however, finds safety for the House in this multitude of councillors; and that resultant confusion, which is espied by others, he does not discover. Most justly, as he asserts, the committee system has beneficial influences. The chief standing committees supply in their chairmen leaders to the House of Representatives, who would otherwise be wanting; and the guidance of men, "who, by long continuous service, have thoroughly established themselves in the confidence of the House," is invaluable. By their service upon these committees the minorities in Congress, and the varied sections in the Union, find repre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentation and a field for their energies otherwise unattainable. Ample opportunities are afforded for debate, and a check is imposed on slovenly legislation. These committees also act as a training ground for the growing statesmen, and bring mature politicians of opposing parties and of different areas of state life into close and friendly relations. Besides these and other blessings that Mr. Herbert ascribes to the House of Representatives, he asserts that they form a guaranty that the people of the United States are determined "that this country shall be great and free and prosperous. And so it is to be."

To the ejaculation which closes Mr. Herbert's essay, Mr. Taylor cannot add his "so be it": his approval would not go beyond an amen "with a difference." Deeply impressed with the "lack of leadership and directing power," in the House of Representatives, which renders its labors chaotic and fruitless, he suggests a remedy; and it is a remedy which deserves sincere respect and consideration from his fellow-countrymen. He proposes to invest the Cabinet with the "right to appear in both Houses to propose measures of legislation" on "great objects of a national character," "and to debate them, without the power to vote"; while, on the other hand, he suggests that Congress should not be able to drive the Cabinet from power by a rejection of their bills. The entire freedom from responsibility which this provision entails on the Cabinet and on Congress, to a mind trained in Westminster, seems to place both bodies in a false position. A knowledge that the Executive Government depends upon the decision of a Legislative Assembly forms a wholesome check upon a reckless use of their voting power. Freed from this check, Congress can deal with the Cabinet bills wholly regardless of their authors. The Cabinet also, as their position cannot be touched by Congress, may be tempted to try experiments in legislation, and to fly political kites instead of directing their energies toward useful proposals. According to the insight that official experience has afforded me, a government entrusted with the proposal of legislation, who are denied a bodily presence in the House of Representatives, and who do not rise, fall, or stand as members of the House, would find that they were charged with the depressing task of "twisting ropes of sand." Even as a business matter, legislation is barely possible to men who stand below the Bar of the House. The personal touch of a bill is es-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sential to give it a chance of becoming law, especially if it has to be carried through a legislature crowded with busy workers. In committee, especially, instant and constant watchfulness is vital to the safety of a bill. According to an Elizabethan parliamentary maxim, "no Committee can destroy a Bill"; but if that rule was binding upon Congress, a committee can effectually overlay and stifle the bills that are entrusted to them, even in the presence of their creators; how far more easily could a committee squeeze into nothingness the parentless foundlings of a Cabinet! And turning to the floor of the House, in the rough and tumble of free and open debate that takes place there, invective and sarcasm discharged across the Bar would not touch the most tender-hided legislator who was within the shelter of the House. A word from a man who could vote against a bill would outweigh the entreaties and warnings of any man, however eloquent, who can only plead in its behalf. An outsider can only bark, bite he cannot.

Mr. Taylor foresees this danger and considers that the duties and responsibility created by the initiation of legislation would endow the Cabinet with power to overcome these legislative trials. The duty, as he remarks, of "drafting and debating great national measures," would force the Cabinet "to surround itself with a trained fighting force." But these fighters would only strike the air, if they are barred out from contact with their opponents. The Cabinet, under Mr. Taylor's scheme, must, as now, rely for the conduct of their bills through the House on "the political friends of the administration." But under the new regime those Cabinet friends would be charged with important and onerous duties, which would impart to them a novel, and perhaps a hazardous position in the Constitution. Their exertions in the House as defenders of the Cabinet bills would identify them with the Cabinet—would, to a certain extent, raise them above the Cabinet. Human nature placed on such vantage ground could hardly resist the temptation afforded by such a commanding position. The congressional friends of the administration might become its masters.

Mr. Taylor prophesies an assured success for his proposal, because "a Cabinet system—under which the Ministry sit in the Chambers with the right to initiate legislation, and to debate without the right to vote, and without losing office upon an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adverse vote—has worked well in practice," and, in proof, he points to "the experience of a federal system strikingly like our own," namely, the Swiss Federal Constitution. This fact may give ground for hope, but a shield that covers a pigmy would be a nothing to a giant. Surely a constitutional engine, that can cope with the needs of Switzerland, might break down under the stress and strain to which it would be subjected by a nation that justly names itself after one of the four quarters of the globe.

There is, moreover, a practical difficulty in the realization of Mr. Taylor's scheme for Cabinet legislation which evidently he has not foreseen, though obvious to those who are versed in the ways either of Congress or of Parliament.

This is the difficulty. How can sufficient time and opportunity be obtained from the House of Representatives, to ensure the successful promotion of the Cabinet bills? And can any arrangement be devised which would act in harmony with the committee organization as it now exists? Mr. Taylor asserts, on the one hand, that the Cabinet bills must "be lifted up out of the mass, debated and disposed of in advance of all other business"; and yet, he subsequently remarks, that "under the committee system, as now organized, the several great committees control in turn the business of the House," whilst, "under the modified system," that he advocates, "the Cabinet would simply have its turn." These two propositions are, in effect, contradictory. To secure for Cabinet legislation a fair chance, the Cabinet must have absolute command over a large portion of each session. Free, open and continuous debate alone can set in motion those waves of public opinion, within Congress and without, which drive important national measures through the clash of conflicting interests, and over the opposition that they must create. And who can prescribe close and narrow limits to free and open debate? "If two men ride on one horse, one must ride behind"; and if Cabinet business is to be "disposed of in advance of all other business," a large restriction must be imposed upon the legislative output of the fifty-six standing committees who dominate over Congress. If the Cabinet is empowered to lift their bills "up out of the mass" of ordinary congressional work, the committees, big and little, must all stand down. If their powers are not curbed, the Cabinet will be mobbed and jostled out of the course by their fifty-six rivals in the legislative race;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nay, even though the action of the Cabinet be stoutly fenced about, and strictly protected, still the chairmen of the principal committees, such as the committees of Ways and Means and the Appropriations might easily, by combined action, hustle the Cabinet bills off the floor of the House.

The strong new Cabinet wine, which Mr. Taylor pours into the House of Representatives, assuredly will burst the old congressional bottle, unless its sides are fortified by many a hoop and rivet. To play the part of instrument-maker to the Constitution of the United States is not a *rôle* for an outsider; I therefore will begin the task on which, with some timidity, I propose to venture, namely, to consider the effect, using Mr. Taylor's apt phrase, of "the headless committee system," upon the national expenditure for which Congress is responsible.

"Do you understand your own government?" If that question was asked of a citizen of the United States regarding the finance system of his Congress, the reply would be, "Yes, certainly, it is spending made easy; if proof be wanted, look at the surpluses of former years; look at the deficit of last year." Yet it never entered the minds of those skillful scrutinizers, Prof. Woodrow Wilson and Prof. Bryce, when they examined the ways of Congress, less than ten years ago, that Congress could attain such a result. Enabled as they are by the study of the past to spy as far as may be into the future, a national deficit, whilst America reposed in absolute peace, seemed to them an impossible achievement.

That the appearance of a big figure on the wrong side of the public ledger is the natural outcome of Congress is shown in another way. The sweet-toned comments made by Mr. Herbert in his essay on the House of Representatives are nowise disturbed by this phenomenon. The event is to him so "in order" that it is passed by unnoticed. Even the increasing money-spending power conferred on the House, by an increased multiplication of their spending committees, is mentioned with approval.

The swelling dimensions of the yearly account which Congress now presents to the United States has attracted some attention. During March, 1892, two eminent practitioners in congressional affairs dealt with the subject in this REVIEW,* the Hon. T. B. Reed—an advocate of more and more expenditure, and the Hon.

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, March, 1892.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. S. Holman—of less and less. But as these essays on the art of "Spending Public Money" are mainly inspired by party spirit, their arguments are useless to a Britisher. The contention I venture to raise is not against party, but against procedure; it is to show that while Congress, as I presume, exists to remove grievances, the biggest grievance that afflicts the United States lies in Congress itself, in the method used by both Houses for the appropriation of public money.

For this endeavor I can claim no novelty. The bright intelligence which animates Prof. Woodrow Wilson has ably pictured the financial muddledom that reigns throughout Congress; and to his remarks, these remarks owe their origin. And he has recognized, to a certain extent, the essential difference that exists between the financial procedure used by Congress and the monetary system which prevails in our Parliament. Thus, here also, in the following comparison between the financial ways of Congress and of Parliament, I gladly accept his leadership. To this word of acknowledgment the writer must add a word of disclaimer. His comparison is not designed to vaunt the practice in vogue at Westminster, or to run down that of Congress. Congress, whatever may be the machinery provided for them, will make it serve their turn. The legislators of the United States, with artistic ingenuity, handle effectively constitutional appliances, however clumsy, and can put the foolish things allotted to their use to wise purposes.

Having thus sought to purge myself of national self-conceit, and to do justice to my brothers across the seas, the comparison in hand shall begin with a study of the relative positions of the highest authorities in Congress and in Parliament.

Our Speaker, we may affirm with pride, is the realization of impartiality. So utterly is the member of Parliament obliterated by his elevation to the Chair, that I may recall this slip of the tongue a Speaker made—with pardonable forgetfulness. He said: "I should recommend,—if I were in the House—"! The Speaker is also not only the maintainer of the privileges of Parliament, but he is the special guardian of the public purse. He rigidly enforces the rules which fasten the initiation of expenditure upon the shoulders of the government, and which impose delays upon the passage of a money bill. I have heard a Speaker, though the suggestion was made solely for the convenience of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House, firmly resist an appeal from the Prime Minister for a slight infraction of the rule which retards the progress of a money bill. And passing beyond questions of procedure, the present distinguished occupant of the Chair,—the occasion requiring his intervention,—maintained the constitutional principle that no unapplied surplus over and above the money devoted to the service of the year should lie dormant in the Treasury. He warned the House, as his authoritative opinion, that no portion of the public revenue could be reserved for accumulation, pending the decision of Parliament, or be left without a specific appropriation operative during the current financial year. And the Speaker's declaration was obeyed by the government, though obedience imposed upon them a task by no means easy. Again, as part of the ordinary duties of the chair, the Speaker, through officials acting in his behalf, enforces the rule that the grants made for each year's service should correspond exactly with the issues out of the Consolidated Fund authorized for that purpose by the Committee of Ways and Means.

The duties imposed on the distinguished men who occupy the chair in the House of Representatives are far otherwise. The Speaker of that House is a great party chief: an umpire bound, if he can help it, not to rule his own side out. Accordingly, the result of a session may be predicted from the occupant of the chair. To use the Scottish adage, "Show me the man and I will show you the law," members of the House of Representatives may say, "Show us our Speaker, and we will show you the course of public business." And, therefore, if a "Billion Dollar" Congress be the programme of the Speaker's party, a whole shoal of appropriation bills will be safely piloted through their appointed course.

Our Chairman of Ways and Means rivals the Speaker in freedom from party bias; and from a thought of rivalry with the Speaker he would shrink instinctively. On the contrary, as did happen in "the old days" of the House of Representatives, so it may happen in days to come, "the Chairman of the Committee of Appropriations, by skillfully manœuvering his bills, could control the House in spite of the Speaker, and of all other leadership."*

Passing on to the business methods which regulate the appropriation of public money in Westminster and in Washington, a marked difference occurs at the starting point in these proceed-

*The Hon. T. B. Reed, NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, March, 1892.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings. By a self-imposed disability the Commons have interposed a barrier between themselves and the Treasury, which effectually prevents their even touching the public purse. To save themselves from the temptation which proximity to money, especially other people's money, always engenders, the House of Commons perceived that but one hand, and not their hands, should turn the national money tap; and at the beginning of the last century, when intemperate jealousy for their parliamentary rights was a passion, they gave effect to this sagacious determination. Sore pressed by petitioners urging specious demands upon the Treasury and upon their representatives, to withstand those sturdy beggars, the Commons had resort to help from without. Immemorial constitutional usage showed them where that help could be found.

From England's earliest days taxes are "the king's taxes," both in principle and practice. Under an equally ancient usage the House of Commons cannot grant the yearly supplies for the service of the kingdom, save upon a demand from the Crown. The Sovereign presents the estimates on which those grants are based; and, whilst the Commons can give less, they cannot give more than the sums specified in the estimates. Every grant also of money to meet the national demands of the year is voted as a supply "for the service of Her Majesty," and cannot be issued by the Treasury save upon her royal order under the sign manual.

Adopting the principle enforced by these usages, the Commons resolved, December 11, 1706, that they would receive no petition praying for public money unless it was recommended to them by the Crown; and this rule was at once extended to every motion for any money grant, and was embodied in three standing orders, the first, and, for more than a century, the only standing orders appointed by the Commons for their self-government. The utility of the self-denying ordinance the House thus passed upon itself needs no trumpeting.

The adoption of a rule based on the prerogative of the Crown cannot be suggested to a republican. Even an approach to the principle which underlies this rule is beyond the scope of Congress. The American scheme of government, which is based on government through diffusion of power, denies existence to any single authority who could sanction the initiation of State expenditure. And thus, in this matter, whatever be the result of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course, Congress may say, with Mr. Richard Alger in "Pembroke,"—"I've got into this track now, and I'll die before I get out of it."

The House of Commons, however, having followed the right track in their money procedure, proceeded onward still further. The assistance of that faithful servant of the community, "Publicity," was called in to strengthen the House toward ensuring a wise use of the public revenue. When the Commons placed the money control in the hands of the government, they also, by standing orders, prescribed that all levy of taxation and all public expenditure should, as an invariable preliminary, be discussed by a committee of the whole House, and that a single stage only in any money transaction should be taken at each successive sitting.

Under these rules, to commence a bill for a money grant, a member must place in the Speaker's hands a motion paper for the appointment of a committee of the whole House, fixed for a subsequent day, to consider the grant; and, if called upon, he explains to the House the object of that proceeding. Thereupon a minister of the Crown, whose name, attached to the record of the proceeding, is entered upon the journal, must rise and signify to the Speaker and to the House that the proposal is recommended by the Crown. The Speaker then submits to the vote of the House the question for the appointment of the committee. On the appointed day the Speaker leaves the chair; and the House in committee votes the resolution on which the money bill is founded, and, on a subsequent day, ratification by the vote of the House itself must be given to that resolution. Thereon a bill is ordered, presented, and set down for second reading on a future day, and the following stages of committee, of consideration on report, and the third reading are never run together, but are taken separately on successive days, however annoying may be the consequent prolongation of the session. The stringency with which this rule has been enforced is attested by the single instance when, with the sanction of the House, it was set aside. The occasion, a terrible event in English history, was the mutiny at the Nore, May, 1797. Some thirty-five years ago a trifling fiscal resolution, on its report from committee, was forthwith agreed to by the House, but the offence was promptly purged by the annulment of the proceeding.

None of these precautions is adopted by Congress. Any member, by the presentation of an appropriation bill, can put

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his hand into the national purse; the bill, by automatic and noiseless process, is at once consigned to what we should term a select committee, who sit in secret session. No special treatment being prescribed for a money bill, it might, when the bill emerges from the committee, be shot through the House, "without being debated, amended, printed, or understood." This cavalier treatment, the usual fate of other bills, is not meted out to an appropriation bill. A money transaction, all the world over, is a thing of sovereign interest; and it is but natural that an appropriation bill, in its final passage through the House, should be discussed with as much publicity and as much debate as the Representatives can provide. Yet their much debate is not much after all. Five-minute speeches in a noisy hall, that gain but meagre report, and that command but meagre attention from the outside world, but poorly answer our notions of free and full debate. And even when an appropriation bill has received the best consideration that the House can give, those bills often suffer under an adverse fate from which other bills are exempt. Obviously enough, it is over money transactions that collisions most frequently arise between the House and the Senate; and appropriation bills suffer accordingly. The dispute is settled on the give and take principle, in secret conference, and often towards the close of a session. Time pressure makes itself felt; to save the bill, the House, without debate, accepts and acts upon an unprinted report of the compromise effected by the conference, so that the compromisers alone know the destiny or the amount of the expenditure thus blindly sanctioned by Congress.

The working out of the contrast thus afforded by Congress and Parliament is singular. Whilst Congress cannot touch an outwork of the Constitution on which their national government is founded, in Westminster three unanimous Members of Parliament might, in the space of five or ten minutes, pass a bill for the abolition of the monarchy through all its stages, the Speaker sitting powerless in his chair; on the other hand, Congress can scatter the dollars of the nation broadcast over land and sea, though all the whole 670 of the House of Commons in Parliament assembled could not vote away a single shilling of the public money, unless they were assured that the Queen sanctioned the outlay; and if, that assurance having been vouchsafed to them, they sought to pass the one shilling appropriation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bill through more than a single stage per sitting, the Speaker would promptly interpose his veto.

The following assertions are themost flagrant of truisms, namely, that to secure a due discharge of duty its transactors, both in mind and body, must feel the keen pinch of personal responsibility, and that, to create that pinching power, simplicity and unity of action are essential. This pinch is applied to all who are engaged in our national financial business. Each money transaction in Westminster, from beginning to end, is guarded by a chain of specially appointed caretakers. A charge upon the people must be sanctioned outside Parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and by the Treasury authorities; inside Parliament by the recommendation of the Crown. The Speaker, the Chairman of Ways and Means, and their official advisers, are bound to see that the grant follows its due course; and the Commons, by the delays appointed to provide opportunities for debate, by the seven separate stages prescribed for the passage of a money bill through the House, give a public pledge that they fully recognize the financial responsibility. And to impose concentration and control on the spending power of the House, the Commons restrict the output of the grants for the service of each financial year to one committee, and, under a Mede and Persian law, those grants must be presented to the nation in one, and only one, appropriation bill. If we squander public money, the nation knows that the Government and the Commons alone bear the blame.

Congress, as Prof. Woodrow Wilson remarks, "evades judgment by avoiding all coherency of plan in its action." This remark is specially true of its monetary action. Adverse criticism is baffled by the multiplication of appropriation committees, who all work independently of each other, and who present, regardless of each other's demands, some twelve appropriation bills for the consideration of each session. The constitutional passion of the United States for the subdivision of power, aided by personal jealousies, has transferred the custody of the public purse from one committee to twenty-five appropriation committees, besides endowing the Rivers and Harbors Committee with a separate key to the Treasury chest. Divide and rule may be a fine expedient in statecraft, but it plays the—anarchy—in procedure.

National expenditure and national taxation are twin subjects: to consider the one without heed to the other, with us, is impos-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sible. This relationship is not felt in the United States. Nor do they sympathize with us in the anxious thought—how shall we meet the cost?—caused when a fresh charge is laid upon our shoulders. The difficulty with them is how to dissipate their surpluses. Their taxpaying "withers are unwrung"; they are, at present, subject only to the soft handling of indirect taxation. We are the "galled jades" whose backs "wince" under the weight and aggravation of an income tax. Borne down by our taxation necessities there can be no more financial sympathy between us and our American brothers, than there is between "a fu' man and a fasting." Equally are we out of harmony in the matter of expenditure. Nay, more, the entrancing spectacle of the "Billion-dollar country" has demoralized one of the ablest among our thinkers. Professor Bryce assures the citizens of the United States that they may waste their billions with a light heart, because they enjoy "the glorious privilege of youth, the privilege of committing errors with impunity." The sentiment is more pleasurable than practical. Whatever sport the men outside Congress may find in the throwing away of their surpluses—they may indulge themselves in this amusement without committing a breach of trust. Congresses are in a different position regarding the resources of the Union: they cannot accept with impunity a mandate to scatter billions over land and sea. They must remember their responsibility towards those who come after them. Members of Congress are trustees not for their constituents only, but also for the constituencies in time to come. Either respect or disrespect is the inevitable lot of every trustee of other people's money. There is no escape; under the one judgment or the other he must stand or fall. That they may render a good account of their trusteeship Congress should take heed to what "one of themselves, even a" President "of their own, hath said"—"It would be prudent to multiply barriers against the dissipation of appropriations."*

REGINALD F. D. PALGRAVE.

* Jefferson, *Message to Congress* 1801.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

CONGRESS AND THE NEXT PARIS EXPOSITION.

THE State Department has announced the reception of the request of the French government for the participation of the United States in the International Exhibition to be held in Paris in 1900, and, in accordance with custom, Secretary Olney will doubtless transmit the invitation to both houses of Congress at the session which opens this month, thus bringing us face to face, as a nation, with another World's Fair. It will be both timely, and perhaps useful, therefore, to glance for a moment at past Congressional legislation concerning such exhibitions, in order to point out its faulty sides in the hope of aiding towards better doing in the present instance.

Governments as such were first officially invited to these universal expositions, as the French call them, by the organizers of the one held in Paris in 1867. Previous to that date, the country holding the exhibition addressed itself directly to individual manufacturers and possible exhibitors, so that there was nothing national and official in the exhibit of each state. Therefore we shall confine ourselves in this paper to an examination of what was done at Washington to promote our interests at most of the international exhibitions subsequent to and including that of 1867.

The two principal acts of Congress in this domain are the acceptance of the invitation and the voting of an appropriation to enable the country to properly carry out what is implied by this acceptance. I am sorry to have to say that in both of these duties, and on every occasion when action has been called for, Congress has laid itself open to blame. In the matter of the accepting of the invitation Congress has always moved too tardily, while in that of voting money it has never failed to show stinginess.

First, as to the tardiness of Congressional action. Here are a few examples of this fault. Although, on the occasion of the Paris Exhibition of 1867, the United States government was invited two years beforehand, Congress did not consider the matter till the middle of January, 1866. Fortunately for our good name, President Lincoln—it was among the last official acts of his life—sent, in April, 1865, on his own responsibility, instructions to Minister Bigelow, making him special agent of the United States government in matters concerning the Exhibition, until the following October, when the President appointed as Commissioner-General Mr. N. M. Beckwith, who served without pay, and served admirably, I hasten to add.

Congress might plead in extenuation of its conduct in this instance the fact that we had only just issued from our civil war, and that the most complicated domestic measures monopolized at this moment the attention of both houses. But this excuse loses much of its force when we see that on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subsequent occasions, when called upon to take action on similar invitations, Congress has invariably repeated the mistake made in 1865.

Thus the first communication of the French government in relation to the Exhibition of 1878 was received at Washington at the end of May, 1876, and was transmitted within the week by the State Department to the proper committees of the Senate and House of Representatives. And yet, nearly a year and a half later—on October 16, 1877—we find President Hayes urging in a message the acceptance of the French invitation, while in his annual message of the following December he returns once more to the same subject. These repeated reminders from the Chief Executive seem finally to have produced some effect, for in that same month—that is, about four months before the fair opened—Congress accepted the invitation.

Scarcely less tardiness was shown in our treatment of the request for our presence at the Vienna Exhibition of 1873. In July, 1870, Secretary Fish called the attention of Congress to the coming fair, but the invitation was not accepted till June, 1872, and, what was still worse for our proper representation there, no money was voted till February, 1873, though the exhibition opened on May 1st.

A little more promptness was displayed by Congress in its legislation for the last Paris Exhibition, but this promptness fell far short of what it should have been if we consider the interest of the American section. The invitation reached the State Department on April 6, 1887, and was accepted by Congress on May 10, 1888, more than a year after the French Minister at Washington had placed it in the hands of Secretary Bayard, and less than a year before the gates on the Champ de Mars were thrown open.

But the case of the Melbourne Exhibition beats the record of Congressional sluggishness in these matters, for, though the invitation was received in June, 1887, it was not accepted till February, 1888, while it was nearly the end of April before our Commission was organized, though the exhibition, thousands of miles away by sea, was to begin on the first of August following.

In some instances the belated action of Congress has caused an actual moneyed loss to the government. Thus, in the case of the International Exhibition of 1878, the space in the main building originally allotted to the United States had been seriously curtailed, because of the general belief held in Paris that we would not be represented at the fair. But when the demands for space began to pour in at the eleventh hour, as usual with us, the Commissioner-General found that our section in the main building was not only overcrowded, but that if our agricultural machinery, perhaps our most important exhibit, was to be displayed, a special structure, as well as several sheds and covered ways, would have to be erected. So Congress was hastily asked for an additional appropriation of $40,000, which, this time, was promptly granted, and $20,000 was expended in order to obtain space which the French government had offered free a few months before and which had been actually in our possession.

Read, further, this bit of testimony on this point furnished by our very cool-headed Chief-Commissioner to Paris in 1889. General Franklin says in his official report to the Secretary of State:

"The shortness of time for collecting the exhibit of the United States and for the delivering it in Paris, was a source of embarrassment in many ways. Our acceptance of the invitation to the exhibition was delivered in Paris

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only in July, 1888, less than ten months before the date of the opening of the exhibition. We were the last large industrial nation which applied for assignment of space, so that our choice was necessarily the last. It is probable that the spaces so assigned in Machinery Hall and in the industrial section were large enough for our exhibits, but their location would have been in a more prominent place had we been among the first to apply."

The second grave charge to be laid at the door of Congress in this matter of exhibition legislation is that of parsimony. Our Federal Senators and Representatives not only fail to act till the very eve of the opening of an exhibition, but when they have thus so tardily decided to have the country compete with the other nations of the world, that were up and doing while we were "thinking about it," they still farther handicap the organizers of the future American section by granting them only just enough money to enable them to escape complete failure.

Thus the appropriation made for the exhibition of 1867 was so small that the late Professor Joy, of Columbia College, who was secretary of the New York Advisory Committee, wrote of it as follows to the United States agent of the exhibition:

"There is not sufficient money to defray the necessary expenses of the agent in New York, and it is safe to say that but for the gratuitous aid received from persons not officially connected with the Exhibition, and the meagre salaries accepted by yourself and others, the work would have been seriously interrupted."

When the Exhibition of 1878 came round, Congress asked the State Department what sum it thought ought to be granted the future commission. Thereupon Secretary Fish—this request was made in 1876—suggested $250,000; but Congress cut this down to $150,000, though later, as we have already seen, $40,000 more were called for.

Here is what the late W. W. Story thought of the Congressional financiering of the Exhibition of 1878. In his official report on the fine arts, Mr. Story goes out of his way to pay his respects to Congress, using this language:

"The sum appropriated was not only so insufficient in itself, but was so tardily given as to render it impossible for America to make an exhibition worthy of a great country. . . . The consequence has been an injury, not only to the reputation of the country, but even more to its material interests. "*Noblesse oblige*" is a motto which is unknown to or rejected by our country. We wish to take among nations the high place to which we are justly entitled, but we grudge the necessary outlay. . . . Whether or not we care what is thought of us abroad, we are at least susceptible to our interests, and these have been undoubtedly affected to a serious extent by the incomplete exhibition of ourselves which the government forced upon the country by its unwise economy and delay."

These two extracts from Commissioner-General McCormick's report concerning this same exhibition should be quoted in this connection:

"So many of our important and interesting industries were not represented that American visitors, with vivid recollections of the Centennial display, and a knowledge of what might have been done, were outspoken in their depreciation of the tardy and inadequate action of Congress, through which many of the advantages of a great opportunity were lost."

Mr. McCormick then goes on to say, and his words should be weighed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those with whom hangs the fate of our representation at the Exhibition of 1900:

"It may be said that, having kept the expenses of our exhibit within the Congressional appropriation, no larger sum need be voted for a similar undertaking in the future. The saving in this instance must not, however, be accepted as an argument in favor of a small appropriation. It was made possible only by the avoidance of expenditures which would have made our exhibit more complete and profitable."

These various strictures would seem to have produced some effect on Congress, as the joint resolution on an appropriation for the Paris Exposition of 1889 was larger and less bound by stipulations than any ever voted for any previous enterprise of this kind. The total sum was a quarter of a million dollars. The Commissioner-General's salary was $10,000—heretofore it had not exceeded half that amount; and the Assistant Commissioner-General received $5,000. After deducting these two sums, the salaries of nine scientific experts and the outlay for clerical labor, over $200,000 were left for the exhibit work proper.

And what results from this tardiness in taking action and this stinginess in the appropriation? The effect is well summed up in the following words of Secretary Seward, written *apropos* of the Exhibition of 1867, and which could be truly repeated concerning every subsequent exhibition:

"The United States section did not contain such a collection of products as would contribute anything like a proper or just basis for estimating the industrial or natural resources of the United States."*

What, then, should be the course of Congress in its treatment of the Exhibition of 1900? The answer is evident. In the first place, the invitation should be accepted at the earliest possible date and the Commission set to work. This would prevent the recurrence of the serious obstacle in all our previous attempts to organize a creditable American section—there would be no lack of time. In the second place, a generous appropriation should be voted. Congress showed progress in this respect, as was stated above, by its action on the Exhibition of 1889. But it ought not to stop there. The $250,000 of 1889 should not suffice for 1900. Even in 1889 our appropriation was surpassed by several minor powers. Thus Mexico spent on its exhibit at Paris $1,200,000, the Argentine Republic $1,000,000, while Brazil's expenditure fell but slightly short of our own. In December, 1888, Minister McLane cabled from Paris to the State Department declaring that an increase of the appropriation was absolutely necessary, and recommended that it be doubled. But Congress did not act upon his advice, and the consequence was that every patriotic American was ashamed of his country when he visited the Champ de Mars a few months later.

This article may well end with these closing words of the report of Mr. McCormick to Mr. Evarts:

"You will hope, with me, I am sure, that hereafter, with a due regard to international courtesy and to our own prestige, when all the powers of the world are to take part in an exhibition, our government may act neither reluctantly nor parsimoniously, but with ready cordiality and in a manner

* The statistics of the exhibition show that Mr. Seward's statement was far from being exaggerated. Thus, the number of American exhibitors was 703, a figure surpassed by thirteen countries, including Switzerland, Roumania, Turkey, and Brazil, while five nations outstripped us as regards the square yards covered by our exhibits, little Belgium being one of these, with Switzerland, Holland, and Egypt nearly overtaking us.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to give a just idea of our actual progress in science, art, education, and industry."

Let us trust that the Congress which acts on the invitation of 1900 will say "Amen" to this sentiment.

THEODORE STANTON.

SOME MEMORIES OF A GREAT LAWYER.

OF all members of the New York Bar, there has been perhaps no one who could enchain attention for a longer time than Mr. Charles O'Conor.

> "Lofty and sour to those that loved him not,
> To those that sought him, he was sweet as summer."

Happy the man who could wander with him on Washington Heights, or over the County of Westchester, or walk with him up and down on his piazza. For such an one he had a fund of anecdote as exhaustless as it was enchanting.

His discourse was not alone of professional experience, but of men and events of half a century. For, as was said by Mr. Evarts at a meeting in his honor, "he came to the Bar when New York contained but 166,000 inhabitants, and he had grown up and expanded with the city, until with Brooklyn it is second only to London in wealth and population."

His anecdotes, often amusing, more often were indicative of his intense love of justice.

Among the acquaintances of his early days was Stephen Price, manager of the Park Theatre, from whom he had an anecdote which, once heard, could never be forgotten. A young British officer, stationed in Canada, while on a visit in New York, had some variance with a favorite younger brother of Stephen Price. The difference was, however, satisfactorily adjusted and settled between them at the time. On the officer's return to Canada, the Colonel of his regiment—Colonel Wilson—hearing of the matter, declared that the officer could not be admitted to mess until he had wiped out the dishonor on his name and regiment; that an English officer who had been insulted by an American, could not be recognized until he had vindicated his honor. The officer thereupon came to New York, challenged young Price and killed him in a duel at Hoboken. After this Stephen Price kept his eye on Colonel Wilson. Learning from a morning paper that Colonel Wilson, a British officer from Canada, was at the City Hotel, he proceeded at once to that well-known place. Following the waiter up to Colonel Wilson's room, he entered with him, when a colloquy, brief but significant ensued.

"I am Stephen Price. I have come to insult you, to spit in your face if necessary, and you may consider that done."

"I will consider myself insulted as much as can be, and you shall hear from me at once."

Having procured seconds—a matter in those days of no difficulty—they repaired to Hoboken, where Colonel Wilson was shot dead at the first fire. His second fled for safety, and the body was left exposed upon the pier until taken away by the proper authority.

For anecdotes like these, showing the quick admeasurement of exact justice, Mr. O'Conor had a great admiration. He may be said to have had a genius for justice as well as law.

The strength and Anglo-Saxon purity of Mr. O'Conor's style has often been a subject of wonder. Where did he clothe himself with such a panoply of words?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Woolsey, of Yale College, who, after reaping the highest honors of that college, passed four years in Germany to complete his education, and was afterward made professor of the Greek language, though famed for his purity of style, in its strength and foreshortening, was by no means the equal of Charles O'Conor, who was confessedly without the advantages of a classical education.

The formation of style is a subject of frequent inquiry. Walter Pater lately published an essay on the subject. Huxley avowed that if his manner of expressing himself had the merit mankind were good enough to assign it, he owed this perfection to his mother, who compelled him, when a boy, to commit whole chapters of the Bible to memory, and especially the Psalms, of which the 119th was his severest task. Others declare that Pascal's way of writing all things twenty times over was essential to perfection.

But Samuel Butler, in his MS. commonplace book, solves the problem in one couplet:

"It is more difficult and requires a greater mastery of art in painting to foreshorten one figure exactly than to draw three at their just length ; so it is in writing to express anything naturally and briefly than to enlarge and dilate.

> Therefore, a judicious author's blots
> Are more ingenious than his first free thoughts."

Mr. O'Conor, on one occasion, furnished the writer with the draft of an opinion of his, accompanied by the minutest instructions to see that every word was printed aright. On examining the manuscript, the writer found that the opinion was in the interlineations; that Mr. O'Conor had condensed into one line of these about four of his original writing.

His overpowering sense of justice, in an individual case, as well as his use of "a judicious writer's blots" were exemplified in the Lemmon case—a case which so unfortunately tinged the opinions of his after life on the whole Southern question.

Eight slaves of Mrs. Lemmon, a Southern woman passing through New York on her way to Texas, were taken from her possession aboard the vessel about to sail, by *habeas corpus*—as illegally held. Mr. O'Conor was retained for their recovery in 1852. After a litigation of seven years the Court of Appeals (Judges Comstock, Selden, and Clerk dissenting) ordered their discharge.

Mr. O'Conor's sense of the wrong done his clients in that case, in respect to their constitutional right of property in slaves, was such that he appealed from the decision setting them at liberty to the Court of Appeals. He there showed by statutes and authorities that while the English Courts in Somerset's case were ordering the discharge of a West Indian negro, on the ground that no slave could breathe the air of England, England had been buying, selling, and holding white slaves for centuries, under the name of villeins, in a state of absolute servitude. He then added : "Notwithstanding the rather inflated expressions of English orators and judges on the purity of English air, English and French air have none of their true enfranchising purity until drawn through the nostrils of a negro ; while slaves have long inspired it without having their status at all affected."

At the closing of the St. Nicholas Hotel in 1884, in answer to a question by the writer, how he succeeded in saving the life of Colonel Loring in the memorable trial for murder committed at that hotel, he gave the following account :

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the trial had proceeded for some time, the Court was informed by the jury that one of their number was a relation of the prisoner. The Court adjourned the trial for consultation on a question so serious. Mr. O'Conor, as prisoner's counsel, consented to the withdrawal of the juror and stipulated to proceed with eleven jurors. The point was doubted, but, on consent of the District Attorney, the trial proceeded with eleven jurors. The only witness to the killing was the bootblack, who testified that on some disturbance being made by Graham in throwing out his boots, the prisoner angrily came from his room and, an altercation ensuing, with his sword cane stabbed Graham, and worked about the weapon when in his body; and witness shortly informed prisoner that Graham was dead. "What did he say when you told him this?" Answer.—"No!" O'Conor: "Is that the answer of one who intended to kill? Is it not the answer you would make if informed a friend you had just seen was dead!" Seeing the jury somewhat impressed by this view, and the change appearing in their faces, he so pressed the point that they found a verdict of manslaughter. The Court imposed the heaviest penalty—imprisonment for seven years.

In Mr. O'Conor's opinion, the greatest lawyer was not the man who knows the most law; but the one who sees at a glance the real question involved; and he often declared that many cases were carried to the Court of Appeals without the lawyers on either side discovering the real legal principle which must govern the case.

W. WATSON.

A PLEA FOR THE ENGLISH WIFE.

IT is scarcely to be imagined that Mr. Grant Allen disclaims acquaintance with that immense English class, the upper, middle, or professional class, and *par consequence* with its wives; yet in his article on "The English Wife," published in a recent number of this magazine, he by inference leads his readers to suppose that that class is wifeless—a huge and complex bachelor in fact. Nevertheless a large portion of it is in the possession of wives—and these helpmates are not necessarily New Women either; at all events they flourished and abounded so far back as the early girlhood of the present middle-aged writer. That Mr. Grant Allen should prefer to leave that distinctly tiresome person, the New Woman, out of his tale is comprehensible enough, but his wholesale denial of the domestic and other virtues to the aristocratic wife—presumably, poor lady, because she is so unfortunate as to have a handle to her name—seems a little hard, especially if it be remembered that the misdeeds of her class are proclaimed upon the housetop, while those of others are more commonly whispered within its walls.

But it is not the aristocracy of either birth or wealth which forms the *raison d'être* of these remarks, but rather the English wife of reasonable, good, or limited means, and who belongs to the upper middle class. It is to her not insignificant existence I desire to call attention.

The type of English wife, then, to which I allude was sufficiently prevalent even in the days when I knew her best, twenty odd years ago, when culture had neither become commonplace nor was spelt with so ostentatious a C. She was of daily occurrence in the circle of a family whose visiting list was well up in the hundreds. From this type of wife had already begun to arise members of educational boards, inspectors of poorhouses, social reformers, and I think I am not mistaken in asserting that it was in England first that women were permitted to fill such positions. Civic and national government, literature, science and other matters not pertaining to nursery or kitchen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were subjects even then of family discussion, in which wives and daughters took their share. It is a temptation to name some of the notable women of that and a later day—wives of the upper middle class—but lest they should be objected to as "exceptions," it is safer to speak only of the common type of this class, that is, the wife who was in every sense her husband's good comrade, sharing his interests (needless to remark these were not inevitably intellectual), his anxieties, business or otherwise, his books, nay, often his *play*, which, by-the-bye, the American wife is only now learning to do. Mr. Grant Allen's middle class wife was already something of a back number, or more likely belonged to a different class altogether. The English wife, as I knew many a score of her, was not relegated to nursery or drawing-room, there to be "cribbed, cabined and confined." Even in those days of Philistinism she was apt to have ideas of her own on impersonal subjects, as well as opportunities for ventilating them. Far back in my childhood I can recall that women discussed books almost as frequently as they did babies and domestics, and that these books were by no means invariably novels. In rural districts, remote from railroads and "opportunities," a mild and refining effort after self-improvement assuredly existed, in the shape of lending libraries, co-operative boxes of books from the great London libraries, and what not, away back in the sixties. Such recollections may be allowed to possess some logical foundation, in fact, if it be borne in mind that the English wife, even of quite moderate means, knows nothing of household cares such as we in the like or better position understand them on this side. Of the back-breaking, soul-fretting daily drudgery endured here by thousands of housewives and mothers—and where else in the civilized world are such self-sacrificing mothers to be found?—to whom comfortable means brings little or no relief from the ceaseless drain on strength and nerves and mind, the English wife continues sublimely ignorant. To the average American housemother her talk of household care conveys a sense of the ridiculous—by comparison. By the same comparison she enjoys abundant leisure of mind and body. Is it credible that the great mass of English middle class wives are, in the employment of this leisure, devoid of understanding as well as of education?

English politics are not, and never within my recollection have been, necessarily and inevitably pitch. The interest, therefore, manifested in them by Englishwomen, to a certain extent in the past, to a large extent in the present, was and is both healthy and wise. Politics, when I was a child, formed a common subject of discussion in the home circle. On first making my home in a strange land—a land now grown so dear—and sharing as a matter of course my husband's interest in American politics and public questions in general, I remember well the chilling reception which greeted any expression of opinion on my part concerning subjects which were considered, I suppose, "unfeminine." But this was in a rural section of the kind in which the men drew apart from the women when matters of any importance came on the *tapis*—and it was a long, long time ago. *Nous avons changé tout çela*—even there, perhaps. And now that the American woman has finally awoke to the vital questions at issue, civic and national, in this great Republic, and finds herself compelled in consequence to grasp the all-pervading pitch with both hands in the course of her gallant crusade against corruption, she finds also that to the "higher" woman as to the "higher" man this pitch is not defiling. At least it will wash off.

E. M. NICHOLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED